University of Alberta

Perspectives on Change at the University of Alberta From 1991 to 1997

by

Marc Claude Arnal

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in

Educational Administration

Department of Educational Policy Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring 1999

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-39500-6

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Marc Claude Arnal

Title of Thesis: Perspectives on Change at the University of Alberta From 1991 to 1997

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year this Degree Granted: 1999

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

1999/04/06

11526-77 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 0M1
Canada

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommended to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled *Perspectives on Change at the University of Alberta from 1991 to 1997* submitted by Marc Claude Arnal in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Administration.

Dr. F. Peters
Supervisor

Dr. M. Andrews

Dr. D. A. MacKay

Dr. D. G. Syrotuik

Dr. D. M. Richards

1999/04/06

Dr. C. A. Deblois
External Reader

Dedication

To my spouse and best friend Rashmi Joshee for her love and support and to our children Gabriel, Daniel, and Anuradha for their patience and understanding throughout this long process.

To my parents, Auguste and Marthe Arnal, who encouraged me throughout my life, and who were always supportive and loving.

To Krishan and Karuna Joshee, my parents by marriage, for their unwavering support and encouragement and for opening their home and their hearts to me.

Abstract

Perspectives on Change at the University of Alberta From 1991 to 1997 was a study that examined issues facing the University of Alberta from 1991 to 1997. In 1991, the University announced a series of measures aimed at redressing its serious financial problems. Beginning from the assumption that there were more issues than simply a financial shortfall, the study identified a number of other issues in 1991, explored their evolution over the six-year period, and again assessed issues and concerns within the University in 1997.

The study adopted a naturalistic, case-study design, and it relied on qualitative methods for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data. Open-ended interviews were used in Phase 1 of the study in 1991, to gather perceptual data from a sample of key informants within and outside the University. A semistructured approach was used for Phase 2 in 1997 to gather similar data from a majority of the 1991 respondents.

A major turnaround was effected on a number of fronts, and in 1997, the University appeared as a well-run institution looking to the future with a great deal of optimism. The importance of constituent relations was highlighted, as was the need for harmonious relations between the president and the board of governors. Faculty commitment and collegiality appeared as key factors in effecting change. Other conclusions included an increased reliance on fundraising, the requirement for greater attention to accountability measures, and the critical importance of

strategic planning and strategic management. It was clear in the study that personnel issues must be addressed, including the proper preparation of deans and chairs. Both deans and chairs were generally seen to be more capable in 1997 than was the case in 1991. It was also found that there was an overall change in attitudes within the University over the period covered by the study. The study further concluded that leadership within the organization during the period of change had not come primarily from the president, but rather that it was diffused throughout the institution. A number of key people within the University had used existing decision making processes to bring about significant improvements. The streamlining of decision making processes was also seen as a factor, but structural adjustments were not seen to be a critical factor in the turnaround. The study identified several areas for further study, including leadership and the development of collegiality, constituent relations, strategic planning and management as catalysts of change, and the selection, induction, and support of deans.

Acknowledgments

The guidance and assistance provided by Dr. Frank Peters and Dr. Mike Andrews is gratefully acknowledged. Their insights into university governance, management, and leadership were invaluable.

Thank you also to Drs. Richards, Syrotuik, and Deblois for their thoughtful questions, comments, and observations.

I also wish to acknowledge Dr. Al MacKay's contribution to this thesis, and to my very positive experience as a graduate student at the University of Alberta. He was always encouraging and supportive throughout, and his sense of humour served to put things into a proper perspective.

Dr. Gene Ratsoy and Dr. Peter Meekison who launched me on this great voyage must also be acknowledged. Dr. Ratsoy showed a keen interest in my progress from the start, and he was instrumental in getting me to completion. Dr. Ted Holdaway was also very helpful in that regard.

Bruce Klaiber, co-researcher in Phase 1, was and is a good friend and he was a partner and an inspiration throughout the earlier phases of this study.

Dr. Reva Joshee, my sister-in-law, also provided helpful advice and support.

Tim Eckert spent many hours editing the text and his contribution was significant.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge all the interviewees who participated in this

study. They gave freely of their time, their analysis, and their feelings, which provided a much thicker and richer description of the University of Alberta during the period covered by the study.

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose of the Study	1
	Research Questions	2
	Background	2
	General Design of the Study	8
	Significance of the Study	9
	Contributions to Practice	9
	Research and Theory	10
	Factors Influencing Significance	10
	Limitations	11
	Delimitations	13
	Assumptions	13
	Research Approach	13
	Situation Within the University	14
	Organization of the Thesis	14
	Summary	14
2.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	16
	Criticisms of Universities	17
	Fiscal Situation of Universities	22
	Universities as Organizations	26
	Reform in Canadian Universities	30
	Accountability in Canadian Universities	32
	Research and Teaching	36
	Tenure	39
	Academic Culture	43
	Executive Leadership in Universities	45
	Roles of Deans and Department Chairs	49
	Conceptual Framework	52
	Summary	54
3.	METHODOLOGY	57
	Research Design	57
	Interpretive Research	57
	Case Study Research	58
	Advantages and Disadvantages of Case Study Research	59
	Research Methodology	60
	Data Gathering Instrument	60

Selection of Respondents 62
Data Analysis 64
Trustworthiness 66
Credibility 66
Transferability 67
Dependability and Confirmability 68
Ethical Considerations 78

4. PHASE 1 DATA ANALYSIS: THE 1991-2 PERSPECTIVE 70
Characteristics of the Interviewees 70
Classification of Responses 71
Detailed Findings 71
Internal 71
Governance 71
Management 81
Leadership 106
External 110
Provincial Government Involvement 110
Other Players 117
Summary of Findings 118

5. PHASE 2 DATA ANALYSIS: THE 1997 PERSPECTIVE 123
Characteristics of the Interviewees 123
Classification Instrument 124
Classification of Responses 124
Detailed Findings 124
Internal 125
Governance 125
Management 136
Leadership 157
External 165
Provincial Government Involvement 165
Other Players 167
Resilience 168
Summary of Findings 169

6. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS 174
Introduction 175
Internal 175
Governance 175
Management 180
Leadership 187

External 190
Provincial Government Involvement 190
Other Players 191
Resilience 191
Summary of Conclusions 192

7. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS ... 195
Overview of the Study 195
Summary of Findings 196
Phase 1 196
Phase 2 199
Summary of Conclusions 202
Discussion of Pascale 205
The New Management Paradigm 205
Leadership 209
Resilience 211
Implications for Practice 211
Implications for Theory 214
Areas for Further Study 215
Personal Reflections 216

REFERENCES 220

List of Tables

		Page
Table 1	Operating Income by Source of Funds, 1995	24
Table 2	Framework for Analysis—Internal	53
Table 3	Framework for Analysis—External	54
Table 4	Distribution of Interviewees—Phase 1	70
Table 5	Distribution of Interviewees—Phase 2	123

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to identify the issues facing the University of Alberta in the early 1990s; to examine change in the institution from 1991 to 1997; to describe the degree to which issues and problems identified in the early 1990s had been addressed; to describe what new issues, if any, had emerged throughout the period; and to offer perceptions of the overall state of the University after more than half a decade of change. While one might expect the financial house to have been in better order at the end of the period covered by the study, the University's success in addressing other issues throughout this period was far less certain. This study looks beyond fiscal contraction to a more general review of issues facing the University of Alberta and to their evolution over time. While there can be no doubt that funding constraints precipitated much change, it is far from certain that funding problems were the only or even the main challenge facing the University during the period covered by the study. Indeed, both the literature and Phase 1 data confirmed that there were many other issues which should have been driving reform.

Data for this study were collected in two phases, the first at the height of the initial responses by the University of Alberta to its fiscal challenges in late 1991 and early 1992. The second set of data were collected some six years later at a time when a second group of major responses announced in 1994 had recently been or were being implemented.

The study provides insights into issues and changes over a six-year period, without being limited to the formally announced restructuring efforts of the University or the single perspective of fiscal constraints. In this sense, the study paints a broad picture of the state and evolution of the University of Alberta

throughout the period covered by the study, and it covers all the changes which were perceived to be significant during the period.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the general research question: In addressing what was perceived to be a major financial crisis, was the University of Alberta perceived to have responded appropriately and adequately to the issues it was facing from 1991 to 1997?

More specifically, the study was shaped through an exploration of the following questions:

- What were perceived to be the issues and challenges facing the University of Alberta in 1991?
- What significant changes were perceived to have occurred at the University between 1991 and 1997?
- How were the identified issues addressed during this period?
- Were any new issues perceived to emerge?
- In 1997 what was the overall state of the University perceived to be?
- What contributions to practice and to theory development can be identified through the study?

Background

There is general consensus in the literature on university governance, management and leadership (Peterson, 1987) in Canada and the United States that universities are under siege (Emberley, 1996; Leslie & Fretwell, 1996; Bérubé & Nelson, 1995) to a greater degree than at any time in their recent history. It is also widely held that "the present crisis is not merely one of resources, although it is certainly that" (Leslie & Fretwell, 1996, p. xiii). Rather, it is seen as a complex set of interrelated issues, the resolution of which will require "[universities] to make

fundamental changes" (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1996, p. 20). Emberley (1996) stated this dramatically: "The University stands on the verge of financial, spiritual and political collapse" (p. 257). The nature of the issues affecting universities, the interrelatedness of these issues in each institution and sector-wide, and the remedies most appropriate to them were considered in more depth in the review of relevant literature. Universities, it is widely held, are at "at a fork in the road and the decisions we make in the next decade will be of epochal significance" (Emberley, 1996, p. 20).

The University of Alberta encountered that fork in the road in 1991. Indeed, it was the first university in Canada to declare a state of financial exigency (Sibley, 1993), explained by Bercuson, Bothwell, and Granatstein (1997) as "the situation that would result from a university being in such serious financial difficulties that its only way out is to lay off large numbers, and conceivably whole departments, of its faculty" (p. 135). On February 14, 1991, a document entitled Maintaining Excellence and Accessibility in an Environment of Budgetary Restraint presented a series of targeted reductions proposing the elimination of several academic units and the identification of a number of departments and ancillary units that would likely be affected through some form of restructuring.

Kaup (1991) provided some insight into the situation at the University in 1991 through his review of the events that led up to the release of Maintaining Excellence. He identified the strategic planning process of the early 1980s as the first important event. "In the early 1980s, the University of Alberta saw a need to construct and formalize a plan for the future in response to shrinking funding and rising costs which greatly increased the pressure on fiscal and physical resources" (Kaup, 1991, p. 5).

A second key event appeared to be the creation, in 1980, of the President's Advisory Committee on Campus Reviews (PACCR), "with the primary focus being improvement in academic and support units" (Holdaway & Meekison, 1990,

p. 106). By 1983, the PACCR had identified a number of areas for review throughout the University: capabilities and capacities, graduate studies, and program initiatives. It was at that time that four broadly based planning groups were set up as a consultation and communication mechanism for the University. The mandates of these planning groups were summarized by Holdaway and Meekison (1990): "[P.G. 1] to determine means for assessing the University's capabilities and capacities. . . . [P.G. 2] to attempt a rationalization of the University's computing activity. [P.G. 3] to assess the University's graduate activity. . . . [P.G. 4] to develop University capacity for accommodating program initiatives" (p. 108).

The Next Decade and Beyond, released in 1987 by the Vice-President (Academic), contained the reports of the four planning groups. Among other things, the document called attention to the difficulties inherent in the funding mechanisms currently in place and it addressed the question of excellence.

> The main goal [of the University] was identified as achieving excellence and being among the world's best universities. This raised several questions such as: should excellence be pursued selectively or broadly? How can excellence be balanced with the heavy demands for service teaching in some Departments? In what areas must we develop programs to meet emerging societal needs? (Holdaway & Meekison, 1990, p. 110)

Holdaway and Meekison (1990, pp. 112-3) argued that the work of the planning groups had significant long-term impacts in creating a realization of the need for change and in pointing to areas for improvement. Kaup (1991) supported the view that the 1987 report and the work leading up to it were critical in bringing people within the University to the realization that structural change was unavoidable if the University were to continue to exist into the future. In October 1989, the new President of the University gave more immediacy to the imperative for change: "I would like to speak tonight about some of the challenges we will face over the

coming years. We cannot be outstanding in all fields. The commitment to excellence must be a parallel commitment to selectivity" (Davenport, 1989, p. 1).

It was in this context that Maintaining Excellence and Accessibility in an Environment of Budgetary Restraint was presented on February 14, 1991. The document hit the University like a bombshell, to such an extent that February 14 was sometimes referred to as the St. Valentine's Day Massacre. The University had entered a period of significant change.

In his 1990-1 report entitled Making Choices, the President of the University of Alberta made a number of important statements about the process applied in the February 1991 proposal for restructuring. The first involved the top-down nature of the proposals.

> We felt that the Vice-Presidents, selected with great care by collegial search committees, were especially well-placed to make the initial proposals with regard to selective cuts. For example, who better than the Vice-President (Academic) to make such proposals with regard to the Faculties, on the understanding that any recommendation would be public, and subject to scrutiny and possible rejection by three independent collegial bodies. (Davenport, 1991, p. 6)

In defending this approach, Davenport (1991) insisted on the need for strong central direction. "Even in this changing environment, it seems vital that the central administration retain the authority to propose selective cuts to particular units within Faculties, as part of its overall responsibility for the academic integrity of the University and its budget" (p. 6).

While there was recognition in Making Choices that "this past winter, the University's senior academic body, the General Faculties Council (GFC) and the Board of Governors approved a mission for the University" (Davenport, 1991, p. 2), it was explicitly clear that the cuts were not a result of, or tied to, a strategic plan. Davenport (1991) went so far as to distinguish between "an annual process of selective budgetary decisions, including major structural changes, and a

strategic plan designed to look five to 10 years or so into the future" (p. 7). This separation of short-term operational decision making and long-term strategic planning was incorporated into the very mandate of the Task Force on Strategic Planning, set up in 1987 "to make recommendations to GFC [General Faculties Council] and the Board on the major issues facing the University during the 1990s" (Davenport, 1991, p. 7). Its mandate stated that "The Task Force's efforts will be focused on the University in 10 years' time, and will not impede consideration of annual budgets or the structural changes proposed from time-to-time by the Administration" (Davenport, 1991, p. 7).

In February 1994 the President's executive committee, consisting of the President and five Vice-Presidents, presented 15 proposals for restructuring of the University of Alberta under the title Quality First. This time, the approach was very different. Quality First was presented as closely tied to "our Strategic Plan, Degrees of Freedom" (University of Alberta, 1994, p. 5). More specifically, "Quality First seeks to support and build upon the vision and principles identified in Degrees of Freedom" (University of Alberta, 1994, p. 5). Hence, there was no need to justify the top-down nature of the proposals, as had been the case in 1991. Quality First also confirmed that

> in each case, we asked ourselves the following questions: does this proposed change lead the University in the direction of our vision? Is it consistent with the principles set out in Degrees of Freedom? Is it true to the mission statement and the seven strategic initiatives? (University of Alberta, 1994, p. 2)

The call for reliance on the Vice-Presidents and the separation of strategic planning and budgeting, which echoed throughout the 1991 President's report, were replaced by references to vision, mission and strategic plan. While there was a strategic plan in place in 1991 (Holdaway & Meekison, 1990, p. 106) and while that plan had largely been undertaken "in response to increased pressure on

resources" (Holdaway & Meekison, 1990, p. 106), it was not seen by President Davenport as a useful document in 1991.

> The most recent general planning documents for the University as a whole were The Next Decade and Beyond: A Plan for the Future (March, 1986) and Draft Policies: The Next Decade and Beyond (October, 1987). For the most part, these documents were not directed toward the issue of selectivity as it is conceived in the restructuring proposals. (Davenport, 1991, p. 7)

Holdaway and Meekison (1990) presented strategic planning as "a process of maintaining continuous fit between a university's environment, its resources and its purposes as an institution" (p. 104). According to President Davenport's assessment, there appeared to be a certain dissonance between the reality in 1991 and that addressed by the strategic plans of 1986 and 1987, such that they were not useful to the University in addressing its fiscal crisis. Conversely, in 1994 the recently adopted strategic plan was presented as the cornerstone of the strategy for change.

Gray's (1986) discussion supported the view of strategic planning as a comprehensive process dealing with the full range of institutional activities. Gray (1986) also discussed "strategic management" (p. 89) which he identified "as an instrument around which all other control systems—budgeting, information, compensation, organization—can be integrated" (p. 90). Even in 1994 it was not clear how far strategic planning had been translated into strategic management, i.e., how well the organizational infrastructures, procedures and decision making processes were supporting the achievement of the mandate and objectives of the University.

It was also unclear which other issues were addressed by the University's restructuring efforts, and what issues were seen to exist in 1997 after six years of restructuring and change. This was especially relevant in light of Saul's (1992)

admonition that "Solutions imposed artificially in times of trouble leave everyone dissatisfied when calm returns" (p. 95).

General Design of the Study

In October of 1991, two graduate students, on the advice of their professor of research methodologies, approached the President of the University to obtain permission to conduct a study and to seek support for their proposed research project. Their plan was to interview a number of key respondents throughout the University and beyond, to determine whether they perceived the University to be in crisis, to discuss the issues and challenges facing the institution, and to gather any suggestions they might have for addressing these concerns. These data were collected from October 1991 to January 1992 at a time of significant debate over measures recently introduced by the President. The second phase of the data collection involved follow-up interviews with 13 respondents from the first study, augmented by information from two other respondents. Candidates for the second set of interviews were selected on the basis of the scope and comprehensiveness of their initial input, on their current position in relation to the University, and on their availability. Phase 2 aimed at gaining insights into which changes they perceived as being significant, and generally, how their perspectives had evolved in the six-year span. These interviews were conducted between April 1997 and September 1997 and they focussed on the changes which occurred in the intervening period, the degree to which respondents perceived that identified issues had been addressed, and emergent issues facing the University. Respondents were also asked to assess the overall impact of restructuring at the University. This case study approach using two sets of interviews with key respondents was relied upon successfully by Leslie and Fretwell (1996) in investigating the evolution of 13 American colleges over a five-year period.

Significance of the Study

The study attempted to make contributions on practical, theoretical, and research grounds. The data collected during Phase 1 were unique within the University of Alberta as benchmark data collected during the early implementation of the first restructuring effort. Phase 2, the follow-up interviews, provided insights into how the general situation at the University had evolved, identified those changes that respondents felt were most significant, and pointed out areas perceived to be in need of attention. An important contribution of this study was in stepping back from financial constraint and in presenting a comprehensive view of issues and changes within the University from the perspective of informed observers. It also provided an assessment of the restructuring process, and of the University's level of preparedness for the future, characterized by Leslie and Fretwell (1996) and Pascale (1990) as resilience.

Leslie and Fretwell (1996) defined resilience as consisting of three components: "distinctiveness from other institutions, effectiveness in achieving a particular mission, [and] quality" (p. 245). Pascale (1990) described the characteristics of a resilient organization from the perspective of the literature on management.

> Resilience entails the ability to continue to function, to survive, and to absorb disturbances. Resilience entails an adaptive strategy, not a stabilizing one. Under this scenario, breakdowns produce breakthroughs—an idea with wide relevance for organizations as well as organisms. (p. 109)

Contributions to Practice

In practical terms the study provides conclusions that could be useful to a number of interested parties. Findings of the study could be helpful within the University of Alberta in assessing change and in planning for the future. Further,

specific conclusions may hold particular relevance for individual administrators and staff members involved in a specific area covered by the study.

The conclusions could also be of interest to Alberta's Department of Advanced Education and Career Development as an assessment of its role in the change process and of its approaches to accountability and planning throughout the period, within the University and more generally within the post-secondary sector in Alberta. In addition, the study could provide valuable insights to other universities, post-secondary institutions, and governments in assessing approaches to change.

Research and Theory

In terms of research, the study contributes to the literature on the governance, management, and leadership of universities. Borg and Gall (1989) held that "a case can be . . . typical of many other cases" (p. 402), and from that perspective that case studies can provide theoretical frameworks from which to assess different situations or organizations. This study also developed a theoretical framework for analysis, largely based on Peterson (1987), which could be useful (in full or in part) in structuring interview or survey questionnaires aimed at analyzing post-secondary institutions. This is especially important since, at the time of the study, there appeared to be a paucity of broadly based research into institutional functioning and change in the Canadian university sector.

Factors Influencing Significance

The study aimed at advancing the understanding of issues in the academic governance, management, and leadership of universities in Canada in the context of the changing realities within which they must operate in the foreseeable future. Emberley (1996) reminded us that the problems are complex:

> We are led to believe by some of the most outspoken protagonists that the fundamental crisis is one of fiscal restraint. That is not the case. The true fiasco is incapacity of academics, outside observers, governments or the media to retain or generate a vision of the University's genuine purpose and its future role in a country known for its decency and balance. (p. 60)

Limitations

Some limitations relevant to the study must be acknowledged. First, the study is limited in that it relies heavily on the perceptions of those key informants selected for interview. Other individuals might have had different perceptions.

A second limitation related to Merriam's (1988, pp. 32-4) identified weaknesses in case study research must also be reported. Merriam noted the inherently political nature of case studies and the possibility that informants might not give the researcher an objective rendering of the facts. She worried that they may attempt rather to influence the study for their purposes. While this is acknowledged as a potential limitation, the study was designed to involve a broad cross-section of informants, thus gaining a wide variety of opinions.

Patton (1990, p. 473) identified three theoretical limitations in qualitative research studies: (1) the reactions of participants to the researcher, (2) the biases of the researcher, and (3) the researcher's incompetence.

Participant reaction to the researcher was seen by Gauthier (1992) to depend largely on the position taken by the researcher in the actual interview. Gauthier advocated an attitude of "listening from the perspective of sharing" (p. 281, translation). He advised researchers to participate in the interview, not as a friend or as an individual with authority or superior knowledge, but as someone who shares with the interviewee his understanding of what is being presented in the interview. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) encouraged researchers to "treat subjects with respect and seek their cooperation in the research" (p. 44). Douglas (1976, p. 19) stated that the more controlled and obtrusive one's research, the greater the likelihood that one will end up studying the effects of one's methods. The ability

to establish and sustain rapport with the interviewee (Gauthier, 1992; Berg, 1989) was also seen as important in addressing this limitation.

The second limitation identified by Patton (1990), researcher bias, related to all aspects of the study from interviewing and data analysis, to identification of findings and conclusions. Here the principal variables were presented by both Gauthier (1992) and Reinharz (1991) as the self-awareness and level of personal development of the researcher. In relation to data gathering, Gauthier (1992) observed that it "is richer when the interviewer develops personal qualities which allow more adequate interaction with subjects and, most important, a better understanding of the dynamic process of the interaction as it evolves throughout the interview" (p. 291, translation). At a broader level, Reinharz (1991) advocated greater recognition of the importance of self in social research:

> The self can be used in research not only as an observer, but also as a receiver and receptacle of experience that is to be explicated. . . . Without the processing function of the human observer, only object-like interpretations can be made of human events. If it is acknowledged that the researcher's social and personal contingencies do affect the research, we can redefine the research task as the attempt to describe and utilize rather than obliterate the researcher's self. (pp. 241-2)

Self-awareness and openness thus appeared as important attributes of the social researcher. In this sense, it could be said that the study was limited by the researcher's level of self-awareness and openness. While this may sound to some like an invitation to "trust me," a realization by the researcher that these factors are important, and a commitment to reflective practice and the development of the researcher's own levels of self-awareness and openness appeared to be important in minimizing the impact of this limitation.

A third limitation—researcher incompetence—was seen by Patton (1990) to relate primarily to the analysis phase. The skills and knowledge required to analyze vast amounts of unstructured data, to identify meanings, and to create

meaningful categories are significant. This is especially so where, as in this case, a classification model was primarily drawn from the data rather than superimposed on it (Gauthier 1992, p. 291). Again, the experience and capabilities of the researcher appeared as key elements.

Finally, Merriam (1988) noted that case study research must also address issues of reliability, validity, and generalizability. Because this study adopted a naturalistic or interpretive approach, these issues were replaced by trustworthiness, including credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Issues related to these latter themes have been addressed in the methodology section of this thesis.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to an examination of change at one university during a specific phase of its operation.

Assumptions

Assumptions underlying this study related to the research approach and the situation within the University in 1991.

Research Approach

One major research assumption was that an approach which did not consider value judgements or constructed reality could not adequately answer the research questions (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, pp. 3-8). To this end, it was determined that a naturalistic approach would be most appropriate in this case study, since the interpretive approach considers that interpretations and constructions of reality are important. The choice of the case study approach was also assumed to be most appropriate to the task at hand, as in Leslie and Fretwell (1996).

Situation Within the University

In its initial restructuring efforts, the University of Alberta identified fiscal restraint as the central impetus for change. Rumours circulating at the time were often more cynical, namely that the crisis was a manufactured one whose purpose was to allow the President to restructure departments and reduce the number of faculty and administrative officers. The study began as a look beyond the official restructuring efforts and the motives officially underlying them with a view to identifying the full range of issues confronting the institution. It was assumed, for purposes of this study, that the question of finances was not the only issue facing the University in 1991.

Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is organized into seven chapters. Chapter 1 presents the purpose of the study and the research questions, and it addresses background, general design, significance, limitations, delimitations, and assumptions. Chapter 2 presents the review of the literature. Chapter 3, entitled "Methodology," addresses research design, methodology, trustworthiness, and ethical considerations. Chapter 4 contains the analysis of Phase 1 data, while Chapter 5 reports on Phase 2 interviews. Chapter 6 presents a discussion of findings and conclusions. Finally, Chapter 7 contains discussion, observations, recommendations, and personal reflections.

Summary

In February 1991 the University of Alberta initiated extraordinary measures, largely in response to its perilous financial situation. At that time, there was considerable skepticism about the proposed restructuring and the motives behind

it. There was also a general sentiment that much more was wrong with the University than just its finances.

The study canvassed the perspectives of 25 key respondents both within and outside the University through interviews, with a view to gaining insights into issues facing the University at that time. Thirteen of the same respondents (with the addition of two more) were interviewed again in 1997 to determine whether they perceived that the University's situation had changed, how it had changed, what issues had been resolved, and what new issues had emerged.

It was expected that the case study would contribute to both practice and theory, recognizing the limitations inherent in this type of naturalistic inquiry.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The task of determining the bodies of literature most appropriate for the study presented an interesting challenge given the interpretive, naturalistic approach utilized, the broad scope of the study, and the largely unstructured approach to the collection of Phase 1 data and, to a lesser extent, Phase 2 data.

The approach chosen was initially to survey the literature from the beginning perspective of the researcher's prior background in the area of organizational theory. The topics identified below emerged from these readings as useful for the study. In addition, Phase 1 interviews were begun fairly early in the process of reviewing the literature, in keeping with approaches presented by Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 50). The issues which were seen to emerge from those interviews also contributed to the selection of areas for examination in greater depth.

- Criticisms of universities
- The fiscal situation of universities
- Universities as organizations
- Reform in Canadian universities
- Accountability measures
- Research and teaching
- Tenure
- Academic culture
- Leadership in universities, and
- Roles of deans and department chairs.

In the course of the readings, the researcher encountered a general classification developed by Peterson (1987)—academic governance, management, and leadership—relating to the study of universities, which was to prove useful for the eventual development of the conceptual framework for the study.

Criticisms of Universities

Bérubé and Nelson (1995) provided an overview of many of the criticisms being levelled at universities in the United States.

> Academy-bashing is now among the fastest growing U.S. industries, and the charges are as numerous as the bashers themselves: teachers don't teach; scholars fritter away their time and your tax dollars on studies of music videos; campus regulations thwart free speech; the Western cultural heritage is besieged by tenured radicals; heterosexual white men are under attack from feminist, multiculturalist, and gay and lesbian groups; universities are buying luxury yachts with federal research dollars; academic standards of all kinds are in tatters; undergraduates lack both reading skills and moral foundations; and, in the midst of all this, to add financial insult to intellectual injury, college tuitions are skyrocketing. (Bérubé & Nelson, 1995, p. 1)

Leslie and Fretwell (1996, pp. 48, 74) added to this list the growing dissatisfaction of parents and students with value-for-money in undergraduate education and a general public perception, reinforced by the media, that management in universities was less than professional. Bercuson, Bothwell, and Granatstein (1997) referred pointedly to governance within Canadian universities as "a swamp of incompetence and a morass of conflicting jurisdictions which blocked the emergence of virtually all creative thought" (p. 5).

Balderston (1995) commented on the urgency of instituting management improvements: "More than ever, universities are embattled institutions, pressing claims on society that, in many countries, society is reluctant to honor. . . . The problems of funding, scope, and mission are held to be severe . . . and the topic of university management thus gains additional urgency" (p. 3).

The Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education contracted Public Affairs Management (1991) to conduct a study into the attitudes and opinions of senior government ministers and officials responsible for universities and their funding in five provinces.

> The sentiment most often expressed was one of resignation and regret that universities are not doing a better job. . . . The study found respondents to be strongly critical of the attitudes and behaviors of universities towards governments, communities and undergraduate students. The consensus was that universities have not kept up with changing societal demands, have not remained relevant and are either unwilling or unable to change. The words most frequently used to describe them were remote, isolated, elitist, arrogant, and naive. (Public Affairs Management, 1991, p. 1)

The same report criticized the lack of openness of universities in providing information to governments: "Governments believe that they must have more information about universities' spending habits and intentions and that universities must be more professional in providing it" (Public Affairs Management, 1991, p. 6). This theme of openness was further developed by Emberley (1996): "Nothing riles the public more than leaked news about waste and unaccountable expenditures. . . . Opening the books has become not only the rallying cry of the corporate right, but also the rallying cry of Faculty and staff within the University" (p. 265).

Not all the criticisms were externally generated. Lasch (1995) argued that "Debates about higher education, as they are reported in the national media, strengthen the impression that the new elites live in a little world of their own, far removed from the everyday concerns of ordinary men and women" (p. 176). Bérubé and Nelson (1995) classified debate among academics as "such that natural assessments of university life are very difficult to come by, and even when they are voiced, they are rarely heeded" (p. 3).

Sibley (1993) saw a partial explanation for this inability to dialogue.

> Concentration on the "stuff" of knowledge is what academics have in common; but nowadays (as Clark puts it) what they have least in common is common knowledge. The disciplines fly apart from one another, and at ever increasing velocity. Moreover, the universities become "bottom-heavy". The "action" and excitement are more and more to be found at the Department level, where the experts reign supreme over their own

> disciplinary turf. Faculty consequently become less interested in and less competent even to understand matters of broad university policy. (p. 119)

Bérubé and Nelson (1995) classified this as a kind of an "idiot savant academic culture. Faculty members maintain expertise in their disciplines but remain mostly ignorant about how the University works" (p. 25). Faculty were perceived as being slow to engage in problem solving at the macro level while being quick "to let top administrators tilt at fiscal windmills and take the blame when things do not improve immediately" (Leslie & Fretwell, 1996, p. 239).

Several researchers addressed the question of academic engagement in debate on the future of universities:

> The purposes and functions of the University must be discussed in Faculty forums, scholarly journals, and the news media with more intelligence then most of us have seen over the past 30 years. No paradigmatic shift is required for Faculty to discuss more wisely and well the purposes of the institutions and programs, but empirical knowledge, analytical thought and logical reasoning are mandatory. (Fincher & Cameron, 1993, p. 33)

Alpert (1986) made a similar plea:

> Developing a sense of shared purpose, a new national policy, or a new map for the future university will call for a new mode of organizational learning. . . . The participants will need to develop a common language for the discussion of important issues, which may be aided through the adoption of effective models of this very complex organization. (p. 14)

Emberley's (1996) observation provided a sense of the breadth and the scope of the attacks on universities: "Charges of waste and inefficiency, elitism and privilege, irrelevance and antiquarianism come from both left and right, and curiously, political camps within and outside the institution often converge on the same issues in their rejection of the traditional university" (p. 13).

Emberley (1996) envisaged serious consequences if this message of increased openness and accountability were not heeded:

> The stick, however, was funding: universities were told that if they did not tighten their governance and generate performance indicators, subsequent funding would reflect the public's "disapproval". . . . The message has been clear: account for yourselves or expect growing political interference and bureaucratic control. (p. 126)

The literature on open universities and distance education also criticized traditional universities for their perceived insularity from the changing needs of students, from the changing issues and needs of society and the business sector, from the impact of technology, and from other institutions in the post-secondary sector.

Morrison (1989), then President of Athabasca University, considered the future of Canadian universities from the perspective of four postulates.

> Postulate one is that formal institutions of higher education no longer control the market for the provision of educational services. Postulate two is that the roles and functions of various educational providers, once reasonably clear, are increasingly blurred. It is no longer clear what courses deserve credit, who may offer them and who needs them. . . . Postulate three is that higher education is no longer assured the full-time commitment of students. . . . Postulate four is that, while learning has become a lifelong necessity, there remains a basic incongruence between the reality and the public and institutional policies within education that information is a secure commodity. (p. 6)

Morrison (1989) argued that the future lay in distance education offered through open-learning systems. He contended that traditional universities were not adaptable to the dual pushes of globalization and technology and as such they would either have to change or become largely obsolete.

> An open-learning system is characterized by five features: the absence of a discriminatory entrance requirement, a results-driven concept of equality, a success-based concept of programme and service design, a multiple strategy and model approach to programme delivery, and a developmental concept of quality. (p. 10)

Foot (1996) supported Morrison's (1989) analysis in his identification of important demographic shifts affecting post-secondary education:

> The peak of university bound baby boomers occurred in 1979, after which the number of 19-year-old new entrants declined. While this was happening, a new influx of people 25 and older was arriving. The result was that, by the mid-1990s, almost one-half of all post-secondary students, including graduate and part-time students, were 25 and over, up from one-third 20 years before. (p. 155)

Hence, while total enrolments were perceived to be rising, the composition of the student body was presented as changing rapidly. Foot (1996) further argued that several impacts of this demographic shift could be expected. The first such impact was consistent with changes advanced by Millard (1991) when he proposed a renewed emphasis on career education.

> To succeed in adapting to the new world of lifelong education, educational institutions will have to understand that their new clientele is not the same as the youthful full-time students they are used to. . . . The old ways of doing things are not where the market place is in the 1990s, and the marketplace for re-education and training is no different from any other market place—it demands quality and service. (Foot, 1996, p. 67)

Foot (1996) went on to identify some of the shifts which he felt would be necessary if the university wished to tap into this important clientele.

> To win this business, these institutions will have to change some of their ways. Their new students will be there not to get a degree but to learn. The educational institution should not put bureaucratic roadblocks in the way. It should not tell a 40-year old that he will be admitted only if he has a B+ in his undergraduate transcript. After 20 years of work experience, that 20-year old transcript is irrelevant today, and because of grade inflation, his C- could be the equivalent of a B+ anyway. Decisions to admit should be based on the work record, experience, needs, and goals of the student. Educational institutions should also adapt their offerings to the changing needs of these mature students. (p. 67)

Perhaps most critical to the continued capability of universities and other post-secondary institutions to meet the needs of individuals, organizations, and society, was what Dennison and Gallagher (1986) called the "reinstitutionalization of opportunities" (p. 175). In their view, new mechanisms of cooperation could be developed to ensure a system-wide commitment to lifelong learning, greater connectedness between individual and societal needs and the educational system, and levels of access to a broader range of offerings never before imagined. This type of large-scale, sector-wide planning was generally seen to be weak in most of the literature. It is perhaps not accidental that Dennison and Gallagher were writing from the perspective of community colleges, a perspective which universities might do well to consider.

The literature critical of universities pointed to a number of areas which were to surface in the analysis of study data, including vision, readiness for change, management practices, accountability, student needs, accessibility, community needs and services, and academic leadership. Universities in the United States were presented as far more sensitive to what D'Souza (1992) referred to as "the victim's revolution" (p. 17), the ascendency and vastly increased influence of socially disadvantaged groups which he reported to be causing "changes in the intellectual and moral infrastructure of the American university" (p. 2).

Fiscal Situation of Universities

There was broad consensus in the literature that universities had been facing a prolonged period of fiscal restraint such that it was forcing them to implement major changes. As early as 1971, Cheit reported that "one-quarter of all private colleges and universities [in the U.S.] are now drawing on endowment to meet operating expenses. . . . The present income squeeze is perverse" (pp. 6-7). Mortimer and Tierney (1979) observed that "colleges have been adjusting to the cost-income squeeze since the early 1970s" (p. 53). Keller (1983) reported that

private colleges and universities in the United States were "in debt for more than 26 percent of the book value of their physical plants, a total of nearly $3 billion" (p. 11). Leslie and Fretwell (1996) reported a renewed fiscal stress on post-secondary institutions and they concluded that "the current period of stress has different causes and probably will have more lasting effects than these earlier 'crises'" (p. 14).

In Canada, "Changing government priorities, especially in terms of government's overriding focus on debt and deficit reduction, have meant less provincial support for most universities" (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1996, p. 2). The monograph argued that when the cuts were combined with continued enrolment growth, the impact amounted to a very steep decline in the real level of investment in universities. Andrews (1992) had earlier confirmed that "government grants have not kept up with budgetary pressures faced by post-secondary institutions. In fact, government grants as a percentage of total institutional revenue have dropped from an estimated 84 percent in 1983-4 to an estimated 72 percent in 1988-9" (p. 19).

The magnitude of the impact of funding reductions on the University sector in Canada was presented by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (1996) in the form of a table showing variances in sources of operating funds between 1980 and 1995 (see Table 1). Statistics Canada data from 1992-7 showed a continuous erosion of transfers to universities from a high of $11,184,006,000 to a low of $10,215,881,000. Funding from provincial governments fell from $10,104,321,000 in 1992-3 to $9,256,737,000 in 1996-7, a decrease of 8.4 percent, while transfers from the federal government also declined over the period from $1,079,685,000 to $959,144,000, a decrease of 11.2 percent. At the same time, full-time university enrolments grew from 553,954 in 1991-2 to 573,185 in 1995-6, an increase of 3.5 percent (Statistics Canada, 1998).

TABLE 1

Operating Income by Source of Funds, 1995

Source of Funds	**1995 Operating Income** ($1,000)	**Constant $1986 Per Student** ($1,000)	**Rate of Change Since 1980**
Government	5,396,425	6,200	-25.9%
Fees	2,005,955	2,305	75.0%
Gifts and Donations*	58,325	67	-10.1%
Other	197,851	227	-22.4%
Total	7,658,555	8,800	-12.5

*Including Non-Government Grants (p. 4)

Leslie and Fretwell (1996) reviewed studies of some of the factors influencing university funding and the resultant financial instability.

> For the most part, these analyses have concluded that causes and consequences are related in complex ways. Predicting how many students will enroll and where they will go has long been a problem (Bowen & Sosa, 1989). The impact of increasing tuition and declining financial aid on access and choice has been interpreted from varying angles; some suggest that the growing gap foreshadows enrolment declines. Previous predictions of declines have yet to be realized (Evangelauf, 1992). Defining and accounting for the productivity of colleges and universities depends on measures of Faculty work and student learning that are still only crudely tied directly to outcomes (Johnstone, 1993). Predicting Faculty retirement and turnover rates is an uncertain process (Lozier & Dooris, 1991). Forecasting state appropriations is unreliable as formula funding becomes more politicised (McKeown & Layzell, 1992). Certainly conditions vary from state to state . . . and from sector to sector. (p. 19)

Sibley (1993) presented the contradictory pressures being brought to bear on universities:

> Some of the contradictions from which we are suffering are encapsuled in what has been termed "the Quality-Access-Funding triangle". We are enjoined simultaneously 1) to maintain access; 2) to maintain quality; and 3) to do so with less funding. This is an incompatible triad of principles or regulations, to which there is simply no rational solution. . . . The Income-Cost-Deficit set of impossibilities is still another. Here we are prohibited from 1) controlling our income; 2) controlling most of our costs; but 3) are enjoined never to incur a deficit. (p. 125)

Andrews (1992) commented wryly that "despite these [financial] constraints, there is an expectation by government that program quality and accessibility will be maintained" (p. 18).

Several researchers commented on the practice in many institutions in times of fiscal restraint of deferring maintenance and renovation expenditures. The hidden costs of this type of borrowing were seen to be many: "It is a frightfully short-sighted borrowing strategy and the borrowing costs are virtually never included in any accounting for the institution's current financial condition" (Leslie & Fretwell, 1996, p. 180).

Emberley (1996) placed part of the blame for the financial difficulties squarely on the universities. "If the universities had not been flush with money and exaggerated expectations, they would have survived the government's reduction of resources much better" (p. 161). Bercuson, Bothwell, and Granatstein (1997) conveyed the same impression when they quipped that "'Just say yes' might as well be the motto" (p. 18).

While there can be no doubt that the fiscal situation in Canadian universities was seen to be critical, the literature was unanimous in affirming that the decreases in funding were not the only major problem facing universities. Also, while much of the research in the area tended to stop at an exploration of the problems associated with funding reductions, Andrews (1992) went further in encouraging post-secondary institutions to view funding cuts as an opportunity to change.

> In the 1990s the only generalization that would generate universal agreement is that change, complexity and the unexpected will increase in frequency. In order to face this difficult decade, post-secondary institutions need to change, transform themselves in a manner that will maintain or increase quality and productivity while decreasing costs. Further, they must demonstrate behaviors, values and attitudes that students can emulate to cope with their own future. (p. 24)

Universities as Organizations

Cohen and March (1974) presented the American colleges and/or universities as prototypic organized anarchy.

> It does not know what it is doing. Its goals are either vague or in dispute. Its technology is familiar but not understood, its major participants wander in and out of the organization. These factors do not make a university a bad organization or a disorganized one; but they do make it a problem to describe, understand and lead. (p. 3)

Weick (1976) viewed educational institutions in general as "loosely coupled systems often without any apparent unifying logic to their behaviors" (p. 3). Leslie and Fretwell (1996) also discussed universities as loosely coupled systems. "The parts of a loosely coupled system act with relative independence of one another and their independent ability to adapt strengthens the overall health of the institution" (pp. 127-8).

Morgan (1986) further saw such loosely coupled structures as particularly susceptible to what he called "the quest for autonomy" (p. 170). He described the quest for autonomy, by individuals, groups, and even departments, as a powerful feature of organizational life, "because many people like to be in full control over their life space" (p. 170). This quest would seem to undermine collegiality, which was recognized as being at the heart of traditional universities. Hardy (1996, p. 3) viewed collegiality as especially important in times of fiscal retrenchment when the spectre of government intervention and the concomitant trend towards managerialism were highest. She stressed the importance of "managing

collegiality" (p. 191) to ensure that change within universities would be effected without major conflict.

The emphasis on managerialism was reported to be increasing in Alberta. Andrews (1992) described very clearly the power of the Alberta government over its post-secondary institutions.

> The legislation is abundantly clear that the ultimate control and decision regarding major program changes rests with the Minister. The legislation also provides that the board members, who are held responsible to manage and control the institution, are appointed by the Minister. . . . The implications of the legislation are clear. The government creates the institutions, provides funds, appoints individuals to run them and holds power over major program decisions. . . . Institutions are not islands but members of a complex system driven by a myriad of forces. (p. 22)

Berghofer and Vladicka (1980) supported high levels of government involvement because of "the ever growing variety, size, and geographical dispersion of the enterprise, coupled with the government's desire to fulfill certain social goals in education" (p. 59). In addition, Vroeijenstijn (1995) viewed this increased attention by governments as a natural consequence of the expectation of quality, which he claimed to be "in the limelight. Everybody is talking about it and this happens in all sectors of society, industry, service centres, hospitals and of course education" (p. 18).

Whatever the motivation, the involvement of governments in the management of universities, either directly or more indirectly through the budget allocation process and accountability measures, was reported to be increasing throughout the 1980s and 1990s.

Millard (1991) provided further insights into the complexity of university governance:

> According to William Vandament, this complexity is exacerbated by the fact that in most colleges and universities there are at least three rather distinct governance structures that are related to each other but not

> necessarily coordinated or consistent. The first is the administrative hierarchy, which moves from Faculty members through Department Chairs, Deans and Vice-Presidents to the President and trustees. The second is a Faculty senate or council (or in some cases a Faculty union), which bypasses the intermediate levels in dealing with the President. The third is the "shadow governments of the academic disciplines" (Vandament, 1988, A52), headed by leaders and mentors in specialty fields, the likely result is that internal reform is dissipated through governance complexities and even rivalries within the institutions themselves. (p. 33)

Smith (1992), Sibley (1993), and others presented a different perspective on the internal tensions within universities.

> In universities much power rests with the Faculty. Teaching and research are at the heart of a university, and professors control teaching, research and the development of academic programs. . . . Thus, there is a dual authority structure within the University. There exists a hierarchy of Chairs, Deans, Vice-Presidents, and the President. This hierarchy confronts the academic authority system where professors dominate. (Smith, 1992, p. 4)

These inherent tensions were further described by Alpert (1986). It is not difficult to imagine that decision making in institutions where these tensions were not addressed might be compromised, especially in light of the natural tendencies reported by Morgan (1986). This view was supported by Millard (1991) who further saw faculty as an important inhibitor to change:

> A third inhibiting factor is what Alexander Astin has described as a combination of Faculty skepticism and inertia resulting from three related characteristics: the Faculty's "jealous protection of its own autonomy;" an inherent "mistrust and contempt for administration" including administrator attempts to bring about reform; and the "tendency to be critical of new ideas and to display . . . critical skills at any possible opportunity" where critical skills means "detecting flaws in the views of others." (p. 33)

Leslie and Fretwell (1996), Emberley (1996), Bercuson, Bothwell, and Granatstein (1997), and Millard (1991) all presented universities as having expanded very rapidly in terms of their program offerings, their services, and their student populations. Their expansion generally occurred in a time of plentiful

resources and it was spurred on by the rise of many social interest groups in the 1960s and 1970s. With relatively plentiful resources, it was argued there was much less concern for vision, strategy, and sound management practices. Emberley (1996) cited a Globe and Mail editorial from May 18, 1994, to illustrate the consequences for universities of not making strategic choices: "Universities must choose between what they do well and what they do less well, lest the government do it for them" (p. 197). Berkovitz (1995) further admonished universities to "start with the premise that the monopoly is dead" (p. 6).

Generally, we are left with a view of universities as complex, loosely coupled organizations, with diffused governance mechanisms, often unclear goals, and spotty management practices. Their ability to flourish in the new fiscal landscape was seen to depend to a much greater extent on their ability to ensure sound management of their resources in the context of a clearly articulated mission which enjoyed broad support within the institution and without. Pascale's (1990) description of fit, split, contend, and transcend as vectors for organizational analysis, although arguably developed as a business model, nonetheless appeared useful in analyzing the functioning of universities.

> 1. Fit pertains to an organization's internal consistency.
> 2. Split describes a variety of techniques for breaking a bigger organization into smaller units and providing them with a stronger sense of ownership and identity (plurality).
> 3. Contend refers to a management process that harnesses (rather than suppresses) the contradictions that are inevitable by-products of organizations (duality).
> 4. Transcend alerts us to the higher order of complexity that successfully managing the renewal process entails. (Pascale, 1990, p. 25)

Pascale (1990) argued that the main challenge for organizations arises in coping with the relatedness of fit, split, and contend. By their very nature, universities would seem to exhibit high degrees of split. The challenge for them would appear more at the fit and contend levels, which take us into such realms as

leadership, strategic planning and management, collegiality, and academic responsibility.

Hardy's (1996) insights into the use of power in universities effectively addressed these fit and contend issues.

> To put it simply, rewards and resources do not constitute a major source of power for university administrators because they have little control over them. Administrators (and other actors) do, however, have access to other sources of power. Symbolic power is used unobtrusively to influence attitudes. It helps to secure agreement, prevent opposition, and elicit collaboration. . . . It relies heavily on the use of symbols—myths, rites, language—to manage meaning and shape the attitudes and perceptions of others and, thereby, influence behavior. . . . Because of the focus on attitudes and the prevention of conflict, this form of power is much less visible, and members of the organization may be totally unaware of it. (p. 187)

Taken together with Sergiovanni and Starratt's (1988) perspectives on leadership presented later in this review, and Hardy's (1996) views on symbolic power and collegiality, Pascale's (1990) theory appeared as a very useful construct in addressing the structural challenges identified earlier in this subsection.

Reform in Canadian Universities

Small (1994) conducted a study of reform in Canadian universities, in which he defined reform as significant change. The key question being addressed concerned the degree to which universities were seen to be responsive to changing expectations. Small (1994) found clear evidence that universities were "in a ferment of change" (p. 14), and that while most innovations could be classed as being of modest proportions, "many universities appear to be preparing themselves for more significant reform by restructuring their decision making systems and through new institutional planning processes" (p. 14). Small went on to cite several instances of changes to institutional mandates and goals, but the study

concluded that these changes were not sufficient to convince governments that significant reform was indeed taking place in Canadian universities. One might expect government to intervene more aggressively in these circumstances.

In a cross-institutional study of a federal government department, a school jurisdiction and a university hospital in Manitoba, Levin (1992) listed some of the difficulties facing public institutions in achieving significant reform.

> The public organizations have more diverse views on what issues are important, and less agreement about organizational strategy. They have more ambiguous purposes, a wider range of stakeholders, less agreement about what it would mean to be successful, and, in some respects, a closer link with their external environment. We see [these institutions] as struggling with the problem of creating a common agenda and strategy for themselves. (pp. 56-57)

The implications of this complexity which Levin (1992) described were consistent with Small's (1994) conclusions that reform tended to proceed cautiously in public institutions, with the result that they were often perceived to be insensitive to their environment and very resistant to change. "Our current conclusion is that it is extraordinarily difficult to direct an organization's attention in a focussed and sustained manner towards the essential challenges it may face" (Levin, 1992, p. 57).

Levin (1992) also rejected "the simple models which attribute everything to the behavior of managers" (p. 58). In this he espoused Morgan's (1986) view of organizations as complex entities operating in a complex environment requiring complex and multifaceted approaches to change. He also supported Hardy's (1996) view of collegiality as key in effecting change.

The literature supported the view that dramatic change such as had been instituted at the University of Alberta in 1991 was inconsistent with approaches to change deemed acceptable to university communities, a finding which would prove very useful in the analysis of Phase 1 data.

Accountability in Canadian Universities

Much of the literature on accountability dealt with external public accountability mechanisms and more specifically with ranking systems. Emberley (1996) identified three Canadian ranking systems but summarily dismissed two of them as largely irrelevant: "There are other university surveys like the dry and idiosyncratic Linda Frum's Guide to Canadian Universities and the jaunty, student-produced Real Guide to Canadian Universities. Neither of these has dramatically changed Canadians' perceptions" (p. 116). Although he felt strongly that the Maclean's rankings were here to stay, Emberley (1996) worried that they were not a complete measure of institutional quality: "the Maclean's ranking suffers, above all, from its incapacity to assess quality, other than through the ambiguities and distortions to be seen in its quantitative indicators" (p. 263). Page (1996) likewise presented a critical perspective on the Maclean's ranking system: "Interpretation of the 1995 results is thus again subject to numerous pitfalls in interpretation" (p. 56).

The 1997 Maclean's rating system considered a number of input measures which were applied to three classes of universities: medical/doctoral, comprehensive, and primarily undergraduate.

> The universities in the three categories are treated as separate but equal. Maclean's ranks the schools on a range of factors in six broad groupings. . . . In total, primarily undergraduate universities are ranked on 20 performance measures, comprehensive schools on 21 and medical/doctoral on 22—resulting in slightly different weightings for some performance measures. (Maclean's Guide to Canadian Universities, 1997, p. 13)

Factors included student body (marks, ability to attract foreign students, and national awards), classes (size and percentage taught by tenured and tenure-track professors), faculty (percentage with PhDs, number to win national awards, and

number and value of grants from three major federal granting agencies), finances (current expenses per student, and budget spent on student services, scholarships, and bursaries), library (the breadth and scope of the collection, the budget allocated to the library, and the amount spent on updating the collection), and reputation (with own graduates and the community at large).

The 1997 rankings also contained special reports which gave somewhat more scope and depth to the Maclean's exercise. The first such report—"Reality 101"—discussed the changing role of the University through an examination of the President's function, a theme broached in a similar manner by Trachtenberg (1988). In the words of the President of the University of Manitoba: "I am facing a government that is using a cudgel approach to change and a student body whose actions have put everyone's teeth on edge, this is a very adversarial time to be doing this job" (Maclean's Guide to Canadian Universities, 1997, p. 34). Nevitte (1996), in commenting on the decline of deference towards public institutions, would not be surprised. The challenge for universities was summed up as "to strike their own delicate balance: to serve the needs of students and the economy without dissolving into mere service organizations" (Maclean's Guide to Canadian Universities, 1997, p. 39).

The fourth special report, entitled "Research in Crisis," painted a stark picture of the decline of research in Canadian universities.

> Increasingly salesmanship is becoming as critical as scholarship to Canadian researchers hoping to push back the frontiers of knowledge. By the mid-90s the nation's spending on research and development had reached abysmally low levels: 1.4 percent of gross domestic product, compared with an average of 2.2 percent among Canada's major industrial trading partners. Since [the mid-90s], things have gone from bad to worse. (Maclean's Guide to Canadian Universities, 1997, p. 44)

The reductions in funding were reported to have caused some universities to borrow from maintenance, a practice condemned by Leslie and Fretwell (1996).

"The fallout has been a steady deterioration in laboratories and equipment even at relatively well-off institutions" (Maclean's Guide to Canadian Universities, 1997, p. 45). The article called on universities to emulate the University of Alberta in setting and pursuing areas of research and excellence. It also went on to recommend partnerships with governments and the private sector, an approach supported by Millard (1991).

Perhaps the most insidious impact of this increased competition for fewer dollars and of this diversification of sources, however, was its cost on the time of researchers. "Many professors find themselves devoting a growing number of hours to what they call "grantsmanship" (Maclean's Guide to Canadian Universities, 1997, p. 47).

According to Emberley (1996), the rating system still nonetheless appeared largely unsatisfactory: "The gravest problem with the Maclean's survey, however, is its exclusive insistence on what can be quantified. . . . Far more profound notions of accountability could be designed" (p. 121). Page (1995, 1996) supported this assessment, as did Bercuson, Bothwell, and Granatstein (1997). Be that as it may, there was consensus in the literature that the rating systems appeared to be here to stay and that they had contributed to the general perception that universities were ivory towers filled with pampered professors who cared little about students and were largely unacquainted with the basic tenets of responsible management.

Another body of literature emphasized the importance of internal measures of accountability, but there was no consensus in the literature on the most appropriate approaches. While the Ontario Task Force on University Accountability (1993) acknowledged that universities had a public perception problem, it eschewed the Maclean's model in favor of stronger internal quality controls. It also recommended changes to the definition of assessment to include responsiveness to constituent groups in the broader society. The Task Force

further recommended the use of input-output analysis. This approach was vigorously denounced by Emberley (1996): "Systems theory derives from mechanistic models of analysis that attempt to avoid any reference to causes, principles or purposes that are not quantifiable. . . . The black box, not the measurable inputs and outputs, is what the University is all about" (pp. 131, 133).

Millard (1991) supported the use of output measures: "Quality is a matter not of traditional or nontraditional structures but of results—the extent to which the institutions' and the students' appropriate educational objectives are in fact being achieved" (p. 153). He went on to recognize that while assessment strategies have often been poor measures of quality, largely because of their failure to consider the appropriateness of educational results in relation to the goals of the institution and the learner, assessment has nonetheless had some beneficial impacts. He contended, for example, that it had refocussed attention on the critical importance of clarity in developing and formulating missions, goals, and objectives as the basis for any relevant evaluation of educational outcomes and effectiveness. Further, it was seen as having reinforced the recognition that educational quality was a function of effective use of resources to achieve appropriate educational objectives. Also, it had refocussed concern on educational accountability, both within the academy and on local, regional, and national levels, on the substance of educational accomplishment rather than primarily on fiscal and management practices. Millard (1991) also concluded that "in an interesting way, on the state as well as the institutional level, the assessment movement has called attention not only to outcomes or results but to the essential role of resources in achieving educational objectives" (p. 168). Finally, he argued that the assessment movement had helped and would continue to help to weaken, or at least to temper "reputational and resource concepts of quality" (Millard, 1991, p. 168).

In an earlier work, Millard (1983) provided what could perhaps be considered the final word on the use and appropriateness of accountability measures.

> An institution's or program's norm is implicit within it, and its quality is determined by how well its various components cohere in achieving its educational objective or objectives. Students, Faculty, resources, location or locations, and results are integral to the quality of the operation, and the key to interpretation of all these elements in quality is mission or objective and its educational appropriateness. (p. 21)

There would also seem to be a great deal of merit in Emberley's (1996) call to universities to take some initiative in communicating information to the public that might enhance their image as well-run, highly relevant institutions.

Research and Teaching

There are few topics that generated as much debate in the literature as research and teaching in the modern university. Included in the debate are the criticisms of poor teaching and useless research such as found in Smith (1990).

> Research is a word without soul or substance, as broad as the ocean and as shallow as a pond. It covers a multitude of academic sins and conceals a poverty of spirit and a bareness of intellect beyond calculating. The argument that will be made here can be simply stated. It is that the vast majority of the so-called research turned out in the modern university is essentially worthless. . . . It does not push back those omnipresent frontiers of knowledge so confidently evoked. . . . It deprives the student of . . . a thoughtful and considerate attention of a teacher deeply and unequivocally devoted to teaching; in short, it robs the students of an education for which the student is required to pay a very large sum of money. (p. 7)

Smith's views challenged at least two widely held positions, namely that research activity leads inescapably to better teaching, and that basic research as conducted in universities represents a significant contribution to the generation of knowledge.

While advocating support for a linkage between teaching and research, Emberley (1996) supported the cautions struck by Smith (1990):

> While in principle, teaching and research are correlates of one another, in practice, especially in the humanities, and arguably in the social sciences, some research is worth little and some diverts Faculty from the responsibility of teaching. There is a publish or perish mentality in the universities, and few institutional efforts are made to invest deeply in instruction. The public is evidently not amused. While 83 percent of Canadians think universities are doing a good job, only seven percent think the research role is important. . . . Many Faculty do not want to teach undergraduate classes, since the very structure of the University is set up to reward graduate training and research. (p. 261)

Smith (1990) went much further than Emberley in affirming that

> the first fact to be established is that there is no direct relationship between research and teaching, the notion that research enhances teaching, although thoroughly discredited by experience and by research, is one that lingers on and is often trotted out by the ill-informed as a justification for the publish-or-perish policy. (p. 178)

Feldman (1987) viewed the relationship between research and teaching as tenuous at best. "An obvious interpretation of these results is . . . that, in general, the likelihood that research productivity actually benefits teaching is extremely small and that the two, for all practical purposes, are unrelated" (p. 275).

O'Neill (1993) commented on the link between publication and teaching: "the studies show that the two are 'essentially unrelated'—that neither has an effect on the other" (p. 112).

Bérubé and Nelson (1995) suggested that "publish or perish" be replaced by "read or perish" (p. 15). They went on to suggest differentiated teaching loads as a means of "ensuring the appropriate use of Faculty less committed to research" (Bérubé & Nelson, 1995, p. 16). According to their proposal, this increased teaching load would be considered in granting tenure, with a concomitant

lessening of the requirement for research. Schuller (1991) supported this type of approach.

> The supposed symbiotic link appears valid at a collective rather than at an individual level; in other words, there could be a cross-fertilization between teachers and researchers. . . . Single academics need not combine the two functions. People get tired of research and of teaching, permanently or temporarily, and not enough attention is paid to the consequences. (p. 16)

Millard (1991) contributed to the research-teaching debate in advocating a more robust definition of scholarship. "If scholarship is defined not solely in terms of publication but as involvement in the expansion and interpretation of knowledge in a field, then such scholarship is essential to effective teaching and learning" (p. 140).

Leslie and Fretwell (1996) saw teaching undergraduates well as a core enterprise of any university. "One of the most fundamental substantive issues our site institutions faced was how to reinvigorate undergraduate education—the economic foundation of the 'business' of colleges and universities" (p. 24). While it was widely recognized in the literature that undergraduate teaching was not afforded the high priority it deserved, very little was being reported by way of initiatives in this area.

Whatever one's views on the research-teaching relationship, it was clear in the literature that there are systemic biases towards research that often have a detrimental effect on teaching, particularly at the undergraduate level.

In addition to the impact of research on teaching, studies also considered issues associated with basic and applied research. Millard's (1991) statement on applied and basic research presented a widely held view. "It is a truism that without basic research there would be no applied research. If university-industrial research liaisons in fact undermined the possibility of the alternative of basic research, both university and industrial involvement would be amazingly shortsighted" (p. 244). Among the principal concerns was industry's "need to achieve more or less immediate results" (Association of Universities and Colleges

of Canada, 1996, p. 26), at the likely expense of much of the basic research being conducted in universities. The prospect of research sponsored by private-sector interests appeared likely in Canada since the real level of granting council support for university-based research in this country was forecasted to decline by more than 25 percent between 1994 and 1998 (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1996). The reactions of the University community to this increased private sector involvement in various aspects of universities was seen by Millard (1991) to be generating "serious concerns in some quarters of the academic community and beyond" (p. 240).

Tenure

The question of tenure occupied a prominent place in much of the literature on university governance, management, and leadership. An oft-posed question in the literature related to whether or not tenure should be abolished or modified (Bérubé & Nelson, 1995; Smith, 1990; Leslie & Fretwell, 1996; Bercuson, Bothwell, & Granatstein, 1997). The answer to that question appeared to depend to a great extent on how academic tenure was defined.

The historical basis for tenure was traced back to the Middle Ages by Emberley (1996): "The purpose of these privileges [granted to scholars in the Middle Ages] was to ensure their independence, relief from military and certain civic duties, guarantee of food and shelter, protection from ecclesiastical and imperial disfavour" (pp. 63-64).

The basic tenets underpinning tenure were described by Cowan (1994) in his summary of a 1940 statement by the American Association of University Professors on academic freedom and tenure (also described in Balderston, 1995, p. 35). The four pillars of academic freedom set out therein are:

a) the right to teach without adherence to any prescribed doctrine,
b) the right to research without reference to prescribed doctrine,

> c) the right to publish the results of one's research and
> d) the right to speak extramurally, which includes the right to criticise the government of the day or the administration of one's institution. (Cowan, 1994, p. 7)

Definitions such as the one provided by Flawn (1990) take us closer to the nub of the perceived problem of tenure as unconditional job security. "In academic institutions tenure is a condition of employment under which a Faculty member enjoys the prospect of continuing employment unless the institution can show good cause to terminate the employment" (pp. 70-71).

Emberley (1996) offered another criticism of tenure: "Some Faculty fail to see that current versions of academic freedom are merely license for misanthropy, stereotyping, innuendo, prurience and vicious griping about students, women and those who have chosen alternative lifestyles" (p. 6). Emberley (1996, p. 65) also chastised those who use tenure to pursue frivolous intellectual pastimes, extramural business enterprises, political offices, social activism, and sexual adventures. The real focus of these attacks appeared to be academic responsibility, rather than tenure itself.

The use of tenure to meet employment equity objectives in the United States was also criticized by Smith (1990): "In recent years, some of the most excruciating decisions on tenure have involved 'minority' Faculty, specifically women and blacks and, more recently, Hispanics. . . . Not infrequently, representatives of minorities are hired whose qualifications . . . are uncertain" (p. 121). There was no evidence, in any of the literature reviewed, of this having occurred in Canada.

In his discussion of the difference between Canadian universities and business institutions, Smith (1992) viewed tenure from the perspective of academic leaders.

> It is true that tenure causes some problems for academic leaders. It has been abused by a few Faculty in the past. It creates rigidities in bringing

> about change in the institution and it is a feature of the University which the public, whose support we need, does not find acceptable. (p. 7)

But Smith (1992) went on to conclude that "It is important for the long term health of individual universities, and for society" (p. 7). Smith (1992) also pointed out that cases of abuse were few and that tenure was generally being applied responsibly.

Conversely, Bercuson, Bothwell, and Granatstein (1997) supported the abolition of tenure.

> Tenure has created the impression that professors do not work very hard for their (relatively) high salaries, with their six-to-eight hour teaching loads each week and four-month summer breaks. We know that this is untrue for many of our colleagues, but it is a damningly correct judgement on far too many in this system. There is no justification now for this "profscam," and the all-but-unassailable job security afforded by tenure is the main roadblock to fixing matters. (p. 151)

They further argued that tenure was unnecessary because of other protections of academic freedom.

> First, academic freedom is protected by the Anglo-American-Canadian tradition of . . . what is a just, fair, and effective mode of education in a democracy. Then, every university in Canada, unionized or not, has a statement of academic freedom that proclaims its faculty's right to write, research, and speak out. Every province has a human rights commission devoted to protecting people's right to speak freely. And virtually every faculty association belongs to CAUT (the Canadian Association of University Teachers), which monitors threats to academic freedom and is free to call for the censure of any university that violates it. (Bercuson, Bothwell, & Granatstein, 1997, pp. 143-4)

In his defence of tenure, Flawn (1990) compared tenure to the American constitution.

> Tenure is much like the constitution. The constitution is not called upon for protection in good times when society is tranquil and working toward

> common purposes. But it is absolutely essential in times when political passions are running strong. Tenure insulates both the individual and the institution from arbitrary and capricious administration and from the political fads and trends of the moment. There have been many more times throughout history when constitutions were needed than when there were not needed, and so it is with tenure. (p. 7)

It was also argued in the literature that the rules of tenure had narrowed the concept of suitability to purely scholarly criteria. Bérubé and Nelson (1995) called for a greater recognition of the value of teaching in the granting of academic tenure. On the other hand, Bercuson, Bothwell, and Granatstein (1997) argued that it did not make sense that, in response to "a tendency to give too much weight to student opinion, the assessment of teaching has increasingly come to be pronounced the most important component of the road that leads to tenure" (p. 132).

Balderston (1995) saw codes of faculty conduct as a solution to the problems associated with tenure. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1971) provided an actual model faculty code. Emberley (1996), in perhaps the most controversial aspect of his book, argued that academic freedom demands a higher standard of behavior than is generally required of citizens in a democracy.

> The purpose of tenure is to preserve and nurture a scholarly culture where teaching and writing can proceed without intrusive hindrance from outside or inside the University. Standards of taste and prudence and decisions based on the canons of scholarship act as justifiable limits on academic license, serving to elevate the right of expression from indulgence to genuine freedom. There can be no academic freedom to vent unverifiable opinion or indecent proposals. Neither can there be academic freedom where interest groups and the governments who broker their power impose the one best way, the standard line, or the approved lexicon by withholding funding or diverting critical funding to non-academic priorities. (pp. 66-67)

Emberley (1996) even went so far as to call on academics to view academic freedom as "the opportunity to speak and act with a refinement and maturity higher than the conduct permitted by law" (p. 274).

Notwithstanding Smith's (1990) and Bercuson, Bothwell, and Granatstein's (1997) attacks, there appeared to be support in the literature for some form of tenure and, likewise, for some measure of reform of tenure or its administration. Flawn (1990) called on faculty to assume responsibility for the respect of the basic tenets of tenure and he suggested that guidelines be developed and adhered to in the granting of tenure. Bennett and Figuli (1993) discussed appropriate standards for the granting of tenure.

> The criteria should be written, well-publicized, and justifiably academic, regarding, for example, teaching ability, professional stature, scholarship, and service. . . . Any denial should be supported by relevant and available documentation and independent judgement by an ad hoc or standing committee. (p. 155)

These calls for faculty responsibility and for more energetic administration and supervision of tenure appeared, if heeded, to address most of the issues raised around tenure. It remained, however, that tenure was widely perceived to be misunderstood by the general public.

Academic Culture

The difficulty in defining academic culture was evident in the literature. This may be due to both the scope and fluidity of the concept. Emberley (1996) devoted much of his book to the erosion of scholarly culture. He saw the scholarly culture as one of two legs on which the University stood, the other being students' needs. "Like students' needs, that culture is neither uniform nor constant. Indeed, its two predominant animating principles, reading in the tradition of books and renewal by conversations, will appear as distinct notions" (p. 39). He argued that intellectual depth and breadth were developed through encounters with enduring works, and that conversation was the vital engagement that held the key to the renewal of human purpose.

> The scholarly culture is an enterprise best understood as an odyssey that takes its members from the immediate and pressing concerns of their daily lives to worlds that speak to the plethora of their needs, if only to return them to their present lives enriched with perspective and understanding. (Emberley, 1996, p. 52)

In other words, the scholarly culture appeared in Emberley's (1996) work as an important motor of human development.

Herron (1988) offered a more cynical definition of culture in the University.

> Culture is what professors claim to believe in when things go wrong, and wrong is how things generally go around the academy. . . . Like health, culture is something you don't think too much about unless you haven't got it. But my comparison is not quite accurate because the people who worry about culture usually worry not about themselves but about other people's state of being. . . . And, for practical purposes, that state is almost always described in terms of decline. Culture, then, is the finest form of presumptive nostalgia; the longing we imagine others would feel if they only realized the value of things they never knew about, but now seem disastrously to have "forgotten." (p. 25)

Berquist (1992) adopted a very different definition of academic culture in describing the four cultures of the academy, namely, the collegial, the managerial, the developmental, and the negotiating. He argued that the two former cultures could be traced back to the origins of American higher education.

> The other two have emerged more recently, particularly in response to the seeming failure of the two original cultures to adapt effectively to change in contemporary colleges and universities and in response to alterations in the . . . status of academic institutions in modern society. (Berquist, 1992, p. xiii)

Emberley's (1996) view of culture appeared more consistent with Berquist's collegial and developmental cultures. The collegial culture "encourages diversity of perspective and relative autonomy of work. It is a 'loose coupled culture'" (Berquist, 1992, p. 17). In this culture, faculty are oriented primarily toward their

disciplines and their orientation is to the ideal rather than the actual. It is argued that the developmental culture emerged in reaction to a lack of organization and coherence in the collegial culture, "despite all its strengths—specifically its encouragement of deliberation and open communication" (Berquist, 1992, p. 93). The managerial and the negotiating cultures were seen as drawing more from management theory and labour relations and appeared more as mechanisms to correct the shortcomings of the collegial and, to a lesser extent, the developmental.

The essence of the perceived crisis within the academic culture, presented in the literature, centred on the perceived erosion of academic responsibility and collegiality, and with it, the perceived loss of influence of academics in decision making within the universities.

Executive Leadership in Universities

Trow (1985) provided a definition of leadership in higher education, based on four dimensions.

> Leadership in higher education in large part is the taking of effective action to shape the character and direction of a college or university, presumably for the better. That leadership shows itself chiefly along four dimensions: symbolic, political, managerial and academic. (p. 143)

He defined symbolic leadership as the ability to express, to project, indeed, to seem to embody the character of the institution and its central goals and values, in a powerful way. "Internally, leadership of that kind serves to explain and justify the institution and its decisions to participants by linking its organization and processes to the larger purposes of teaching and learning in ways that strengthen their motivation and morale" (Trow, 1985, p. 143). Externally, a leader's ability to articulate the nature and purpose of the institution effectively was seen as important in shaping its image, affecting its capacity to gain support from its environment and in recruiting able staff and students. "Political leadership refers

to a leader's ability to resolve the conflicting demands and pressures of his many constituencies, internal and external, and in gaining their support for the institution's goals and purposes, as he defines them" (Trow, 1985, p. 144). Managerial leadership was presented as the familiar capacity to direct and coordinate the various support activities of the institution, including good judgement in the selection of staff, the ability to develop and manage a budget, to plan for the future, and to build and maintain a plant. Academic leadership was presented as showing itself, among other ways

> as the ability to recognize excellence in teaching, learning, and research; in knowing where and how to intervene to strengthen academic structures; in the choice of able academic administrators, and in support for them in their efforts to recruit and advance talented teachers and scholars. (Trow, 1985, p. 145)

To Trow's (1985) list, responsible leadership would add a concern for the public good, without which "the University will evolve toward self-interest rather than public interest" (Newman, 1987, p. 8).

A very useable definition of leadership, which appeared relevant to leadership in the collegial context of the University, was provided by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988). Their definition appeared attractive because it encompassed much of the popular literature on leadership by such authors as Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Covey (1989, 1992). It also conformed largely to the characterizations of leaders as artists and craftsmen presented by Pitcher (1996).

Sergiovanni and Starratt's definition contained six leadership characteristics. The first, that leadership is rooted in meaning, presented leaders as acting out of deep conviction, based on core meanings that lie deep in the leader's own culture. They saw the inspiration of the leader as coming from the leader's contact with meanings, realities, and values that lie beneath the surface of ordinary experience. "2) Leadership emerges out of a vision" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988, p. 202). The leader's vision tended to be a fairly detailed picture of a social unit of

some kind, functioning in certain ways which achieve and reflect those core meanings at the centre of the leader's consciousness. The force or compelling power of leadership was seen to flow from a shared vision of what a particular social institution might look like or become. "3) Leadership emerges out of a dramatic sense" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988, p. 203). They saw leaders as having a sense of excitement about them, in that they could see the dramatic possibilities for achieving those goals they believed to be important. "4) Leadership requires the articulation of a vision and building a covenant" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988, p. 205). It was argued that leaders have to articulate that vision in ways that capture the imagination and enthusiasm of their colleagues. What was seen to make the vision of the leader appealing is that it took the ideas of others, fused them with a more fundamental meaning and value that was central to human life, and, through a value-added synthesis, gave them a general, practical shape, which the group could operationalize. "5) Leaders will embody the vision in organization structures, policies and procedures" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988, p. 208). This leadership involved institution building. "6) Leadership provides mechanisms for the continuous or periodic review of the institution" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988, p. 210). The argument was that the leader must provide for the ongoing celebration of the vision within the institution on a daily basis, as well as provide for periodic major assessment and renewal. In this way the organization keeps redefining and adjusting itself in relation to changes around and within it.

The need for leadership was seen to be greater in a time of change. Covey (1992) underlined the need for transformational leadership to deal with "a change so profound, so complete, that it will almost overwhelm the careful observer. Reportedly, more change will take place in the next few years than has taken place in the past few centuries" (p. 282).

Some researchers saw inherent problems in the nature of the leadership expectations placed on university presidents. The requirement that university

presidents "work toward the reinforcement of [the institution's] mission, its uniqueness, its financial health, its further development, and its contribution to society" (Millard, 1991, p. 68) was seen to contribute to competition between institutions at the expense of cooperation between them. Millett (1984) saw this competition as a potential liability when it occurred "regardless of the activities of other universities and colleges, regardless of desirable patterns of collaboration, and regardless of costs and the economic circumstances of state government" (p. 6).

The Maclean's Guide to Canadian Universities (1997) reported on a remarkable achievement in interinstitutional cooperation in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

> In April 1996, presidents of the city's seven universities agreed to a landmark proposal to coordinate course offerings and Faculty appointments, to create a central registry that will oversee admissions, student records, and timetables, and eventually even to publish a common calendar. (p. 8)

Millard (1991) reported on a similar if broader initiative in Oklahoma to coordinate the full range of offerings in that state. "If not unique at least an exemplary characteristic of the project is the effective use of a wide range and combination of internal and external educational leaders, consultants and experts from the higher education community" (pp. 17-18).

In the absence of such arrangements, one could expect the state to play a much more interventionist role in the post-secondary sector and the institutions within it. In any event, one might expect the state to play a very active role in facilitating sector-wide planning and decision making by the institutions themselves, thus ensuring that a broader dimension of sector-wide responsibility was added to the presidents' leadership roles.

Roles of Deans and Department Chairs

The descriptions of the roles of deans and department chairs tended to display the same characteristics, namely long lists of complex roles and responsibilities. Gmelch and Miskin (1993) reported on several studies of the role of academic chairs:

> Lists specific to Department Chairs range from the exhaustive listing of 97 activities discovered by a University of Nebraska research team (Creswell et al., 1990), or the astonishing 54 varieties of tasks and duties cited in Allan Tucker's classic book Chairing the Academic Department (1992), or the 40 functions forwarded in a study of Australian Department Chairs. (Moses & Roe, 1990, p. 9)

Bennett and Figuli (1993) commented on the challenges facing departmental chairs:

> Functioning as the custodian of standards can easily require reducing conflict, redistributing Departmental burdens and chores perhaps by interrupting comfortable and familiar routines, promoting affirmative action in a reluctant Faculty, as well as attending to the major tasks of Faculty and staff evaluation and development. Throughout, the Chairperson must determine that students are being properly served, that the curriculum is updated and scholarship is promoted. (p. 1)

Fagin (1997) described the complexity of the dean's role. He commented that "The dean must be directly involved with others in strategic planning, development, budget planning and implementation, salary decisions, leadership development, outreach, and public relations" (p. 96). In addition to these functions, deans were presented as indirectly involved with other administrators who handle personnel management, including affirmative action, training of faculty and staff, physical plant maintenance, and other responsibilities.

Allen-Meares (1997) added to Fagin's (1997) list by identifying the struggle to be comprehensive and inclusive, and the perception of being sandwiched between a variety of forces and groups. Allen-Meares further noted that deans

were often viewed as managers while their preference was to be productive scholars and faculty members. Deans were also expected to hear the "many voices of the academic unit; tuning in to both implicit and explicit communications from a variety of sources" (p. 83). Furthermore, deans must be able to make tough decisions that rise above self-interest groups and politics.

Rutherford (1992) saw three complementary functions that any effective leader must attend to: "achieving the tasks, building and maintaining the team, developing the individuals in the team" (p. 206). He contended that leaders are most effective when these are attended to simultaneously.

Gmelch (1991) decried what he perceived to be the lack of attention given to obstacles to the recruitment of academic department chairs in the modern research on leadership in universities:

> Rarely do we study what is perhaps the most important impediment in attracting academic leaders to the smallest yet most significant unit in the University, the administration of the academic Department where nearly 80 percent of all administrative decisions take place. What price does a professor pay for academic leadership? What surprises and sacrifices are embedded in the department chair position? (p. 3)

Dill (1980) likewise called for more study on the role of deans: "Deanships, deans, and 'deaning' deserve more study than they have received" (p. 261).

Notwithstanding broad agreement on the complexities and the importance of the roles, Gmelch and Miskin (1993), Booth (1982), Kramer (1997), and others recognized that very little training was available to deans or department chairs. As a result they were often ill-equipped to carry out their duties. Cowan (1994) gave an overview of the range of impediments facing academic administrators.

> One must understand that the majority of academics who become academic administrators do not like administration itself, do not think of themselves as administrators, have no training for their administrative roles other than popular television shows and modest on-the-job exposure, and are accustomed to work in a milieu where the exercise of authority is

> considered in bad taste. Indeed, most expect to return to the ranks of working Faculty after a brief sojourn in administration, and all are steeped in the important university traditions of academic freedom, pluralism, tolerance of eccentricity and reliance on self-direction for selling tasks. Giving an order, even a reasonable one, is anathema to many. (p. 1)

Another limitation according to Eble (1993) was the recruitment process itself:

> Although there are Chairpersons who are picked because they are leaders and spokespersons, conditions do not favor such appointments. . . . In the first place, the choice of Chairpersons is limited to the members of the Department. . . . And whatever the choice the person most often comes into it trailing relationships already established and with a necessity of maintaining relationships not with employees, but with colleagues and friends. (p. 24)

Problems in selecting deans were also identified:

> Surveys over the years confirm that previous management experience does rank low as a necessary credential. . . . The general tendency to stress academic background which fits the school's disciplines and programs add further to the problem. . . . Most deans are likely to have had no managerial education whatsoever. (Dill, 1980, p. 278)

Seagren, Creswell, and Wheeler (1993) called for an improvement of the quality of leadership at all levels within the university but particularly at the level of chairs:

> Chairs should consider human resources, the structure of the organization, and political and symbolic frames of reference in providing leadership to the Department. They must pay attention to upgrading leadership skills through mentoring, reading, workshops, self-assignment, and networking. (p. vi)

Ehrlich (1987) underlined the importance of performance reviews: "It is important to have a formal review process for all academic administrators, including deans, presidents, and provosts" (p. 93).

Deans and chairs were generally seen to be key figures in the management of universities, yet there were perceived to be many impediments to them effectively playing their central roles. Drolet (1995) reported that "there aren't many people who fully grasp the way a university administration works" (p. 11). He went on to recommend that universities offer mandatory management training for first-time university administrators.

Conceptual Framework

Because of the interpretive nature of the study, the review of the literature, which had begun in the earliest stages of development of the study, continued throughout the collection and analysis of Phase 1 data, and it was informed by that analysis. Hence the conceptual framework for the study grew partly from the review of the literature, and partly from the process of analysis of Phase 1 data.

In reviewing our data prior to analysis, two major groupings became very evident: "Internal Issues" and "External Issues." This classification was later confirmed by Leslie and Fretwell (1996) as useful for case study analysis of colleges and universities.

The general classification developed by Peterson (1987)—academic governance, management, and leadership—was encountered early in the review of the literature and it was identified as a promising framework for the analysis of internal issues. In conducting the data analysis described in the methodology section of this study, we tested the three headings as a possible general framework, and having found them suitable, we adopted them as the basis for our classification. The subheadings identified under governance, management, and leadership in Table 2 were then drawn from the data analysis in the manner described later. This process confirmed for the researchers their earlier impression that the three headings chosen were indeed very appropriate for the analysis of the "Internal Issues" grouping.

TABLE 2

Framework for Analysis—Internal

Governance	**Management**	**Leadership**
Nature of Universities	Resources	President and Executive
	Budgets and Financial Assets Physical Assets Personnel Management Practices Accountability and Openness	
General Characteristics of the U of A	Strategic Issues	Deans and Chairs
Status of the University Readiness for Change Decision Making Constituent Relations Vision and Belonging	Strategic Planning Focus of Education Student Needs Accessibility Tenure	
Governance Mechanisms	Outputs	Board and Senate
Characteristics Roles Relationships	Research Research and Teaching Quality Community Needs and Service	
		Faculty
		Non-Academic and Support

In reviewing Peterson's (1987) classification after the fact, a moderate degree of correlation was found to exist between his subheadings under governance, management, and leadership, and those which emerged in this study. It should be noted, however, that his book was a theoretical exploration of the topics and not an analysis of actual case study data, which might explain why his subclassifications were not as elaborate and not well-suited to this study. The "External Issues" subheadings in Table 3 developed in much the same way, i.e., through the analysis as described in the methodology section of this study.

TABLE 3

Framework for Analysis—External

Provincial Government Involvement	**Other Players**
Funding	Business
Sector Planning	Federal Government
Direct Intervention	

Summary

There was no shortage of research relating to the governance, management, and leadership within universities in North America. While the Canadian material was much less voluminous, it generally tended to follow similar patterns to those in the American research. There was broad consensus that universities had embarked on the most challenging and difficult period of their history and that while the current difficulties had been heightened, and in many cases brought to a head by fiscal problems, the problems went much deeper.

(1) Universities are presented as having lost sight of their primary role in society, and as institutions adrift in a sea of competing pressures and demands.

(2) Universities are being challenged to be more clearly focussed, to be more open and accountable, and to be more frugal in their use of resources.

(3) Governance structures of universities based on collegiality and diffused authority are seen to be increasingly unworkable in light of the perceived erosion of collegiality, academic responsibility, and the culture of the academy.

(4) Leadership within universities is generally seen to be incapable of meeting the challenges facing modern universities.

(5) Tenure and basic research are not well understood.

(6) It was further argued that the failure of universities to address these issues could result in a loss of institutional autonomy in the face of government and the private sector.

In brief, the call in the literature has been for universities to embark on a fundamental review of their role in society. They appeared as institutions at risk of losing their relevance, largely, some have argued, as a result of their closed and archaic structures insensitive to the needs of students and society, or partly, others have argued, because of their efforts to address these very needs of students and society. While there was no consensus on the causes, there was however a clear consensus that they were adrift.

Hopefully, a final blow was dealt by Nevitte (1996) to those who viewed the current pressures as a passing phenomenon that could be ridden out. As Nevitte (1996) pointed out, there was a certain irony in the fact that a main cause of this new militancy was education itself.

> The further expansion of educational opportunities and rapid dissemination of information have a variety of consequences: people are better informed, are better able to independently process information and make sense of the information available to them. The expansion of educational opportunities also means people will become more interested in and attentive to public life. . . . In short, the rise of an increasingly competent and sophisticated public also means the emergence of a less compliant public. . . . Citizens cut from the newer cloth, certainly, are more attracted to formations that are "bottom-up" but they are also better equipped to separate the reality from the rhetoric and to act on the basis of the judgements they reach. (pp. 313-4)

Universities were not alone, but neither were they excluded from what Nevitte (1996) called "the declining confidence in governmental and non-governmental institutions" (p. 94), and in "civilian bureaucracies of one form or another" (p. 288).

It was clear from the literature that those universities that would succeed in reinventing themselves and in recasting their beliefs, missions, objectives,

practices, and procedures to accommodate the realities of the times would be the strongest and the most relevant in the future. A major challenge for them would be in doing so without totally abandoning their rich heritage and the positive aspects of traditional academic culture.

> Canada's universities are at a crossroads today. They will either learn how to adapt to new times while preserving their ancient heritage or they will abandon their true vocation in search of perfecting the art of administration and the use of new delivery techniques. . . . The most serious obstacle that Canada's university system must overcome in the challenge to maintain time-honoured traditions while adapting to new times is the system's own shop-worn notions about what post-secondary education is today. (Bercuson, Bothwell, & Granatstein, p. 89)

And hopefully, they will be resilient enough to sustain their relevance through changes that will only increase in breadth and scope.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Phase 1 of the study (1991 interview data) was a descriptive case study of the University of Alberta at the height of its fiscally driven crisis. Phase 2 (1997 data) was a reflective study on the evolution of the University throughout the intervening six-year period and on the current situation within the University. Phase 1 data were classified and analyzed prior to undertaking Phase 2 of the study and the conclusions in Phase 1 informed the interviews in Phase 2.

Among the critical issues confronting the researchers in 1991 were the selection of appropriate respondents and the development of a suitable data gathering instrument. It was also felt at the time that it would be wise to secure the President's authorization to proceed, given the highly charged climate that pervaded the University, and the controversial nature of the restructuring process.

Phase 1 of the study was undertaken as a team research project with a doctoral student colleague, Bruce Klaiber, who has since left the university. Bogdan and Biklen (1998, p. 71) encouraged team research as a "satisfying and productive" approach, but they expressed a caution. "As with every team effort, it is important to be linked to people with whom you feel comfortable—people who work as hard as you, and who share your values and your understanding of the division of labor in decision making" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 71). Working with Bruce proved to be both satisfying and productive.

Interpretive Research

Richardson and Wynne (1988) discussed the shift from positivism to interpretive approaches in educational research, citing a greater frequency of interpretive studies. Burger, Fisher, and Thorpe (1988) advised that judgements

about appropriate methods "are made less on the basis of paradigmatic purity and more on the basis of selecting models which have promise for generating useful knowledge" (p. 84). Lincoln and Guba (1985) supported the legitimacy of interpretive or naturalistic inquiry in educational research.

Because this study sought to understand the impact of changes on the University of Alberta, as perceived and judged by key informants directly involved in or impacted by decisions during the period covered by the study, an interpretive stance was selected as being most appropriate.

Case Study Research

Merriam (1988) presented the case study as "a research design in its own right, one that can be distinguished from other approaches to a research problem" (p. 5). Bogdan and Biklen (1999) described case studies in the following manner: "A case study is a detailed examination of one setting, or a single subject, a single depository of documents, or one particular event" (p. 54). They further described the historical case study approach:

> These studies concentrate on a particular organization over time, tracing the organization's development. . . . You will rely on data sources such as interviews with people who have been associated with the organization, observations of the present [organization], and existing written records. (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 55)

The study described a single organization, the University of Alberta, over a period of some six years with a view to gaining insights into how it evolved throughout that period of acute stress initially triggered by a financial crisis. In this respect, the study can be classified as an historical case study.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Case Study Research

Lincoln and Guba (1985) listed the advantages of the case study approach in naturalistic research.

1. The case study is the primary vehicle for emic inquiry. The naturalistic inquirer tends toward a reconstruction of the respondents' constructions (emic).
2. The case study builds on the readers' tacit knowledge, presenting a holistic and lifelike description that is like those that the readers normally encounter in their experiencing of the world, rather than being more symbolic abstractions of such.
3. The case study is an effective vehicle for demonstrating the interplay between inquirer and respondents.
4. The case study provides the reader an opportunity to probe for internal consistency.
5. The case study provides the "thick description" so necessary for judgements of transferability.
6. The case study provides a grounded assessment of context. (pp. 359-360)

Merriam (1988) underscored the importance of case studies in advancing knowledge in the field of inquiry:

> The case study offers a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon. Anchored in real-life situations, the case study results in a rich and holistic account of a phenomenon. It offers insights and illuminates meanings that expand its readers' experiences. These insights can be construed as tentative hypotheses that help structure future research; hence, case study plays an important role in advancing a field's knowledge base. (p. 32)

Wynne (1993) listed the limitations in the use of case study research:

1. Limitations of time or money to devote to obtaining a rich, thick description and analysis of a phenomenon;
2. A final product that may be deemed too lengthy, too detailed, or too involved for busy policymakers and educators to read and use;

3. Guba and Lincoln's (1981, p. 37) note that "Case studies can oversimplify or exaggerate a situation, leading the reader to erroneous conclusions about the actual state of affairs". They further warned that case studies "tend to masquerade as a whole when in fact they are but a part—a slice of life";
4. That qualitative case studies are based on the sensitivity and integrity of the investigator;
5. Guba and Lincoln's (1981, p. 378) reference to the "unusual problem of ethics. An unethical case writer could so select from among available data that virtually anything he wished could be illustrated";
6. The inherently political nature of case study evaluations, and;
7. Limitations involving the issues of reliability, validity, and generalizability. (pp. 47-48)

Despite the identified limitations, a naturalistic stance using the case study approach was deemed to be the most appropriate design for this study.

Research Methodology

In this study, qualitative data in the form of individual perceptions were the main focus; however, documentary evidence in the form of reports and minutes were also utilized.

Data Gathering Instrument

Harrison (1990) outlined the advantages and disadvantages of interviews as a research tool. Although there are some drawbacks to the use of interviews, "expensive, requires skilled interviewers; sampling problems in large organizations; respondent and interviewer bias; non-comparability of responses in unstructured and semi-structured interviews; difficult to analyze results" (p. 20), they were felt to be the most appropriate method for this study. Their advantages, as cited by Harrison, were significant: "readily covers wide-range of topics and features, can be modified to fit needs before and during interview; can convey empathy, build trust; rich data; provide understanding of respondent's own viewpoint and interpretations" (p. 20).

Our purpose in gathering data was not only to get a listing of the key issues facing the University but to understand the relative importance of these issues for various constituencies, and to get in-depth perspectives on how they were perceived to be affecting the organization and the people within it. It was decided that loosely structured interviews (Deslauriers, 1991) would be most appropriate: "The interview will tend to be less directed when the purpose is to more fully address the research problem, to get more understanding of what the respondent thinks or feels" (p. 37, translation). This is consistent with the approach used by Leslie and Fretwell (1996). Bogdan and Biklen (1998) presented a range of designations for this approach:

> Sometimes termed "unstructured" (Maccoby & Maccoby, 1954) or "open-ended" (Jahoda, Deutsch, & Cook, 1951), "non-directive" (Meltzer & Petras, 1970) or "flexibly structured" (Whyte, 1979), the researcher is bent on understanding, in considerable detail, how people think and how they come to develop the perspectives they hold. (p. 3)

Phase 1 interviews consisted, in the main, of three questions. The first asked whether the University was in a state of crisis; the second requested elaboration on the issues currently facing the University; and the third queried the respondents on any solutions they might have to offer. The second question generally dominated the interview, as had been anticipated. The interviewers did not intervene except to seek clarification or to open new areas for consideration, based on previous interviews.

Phase 2 interviews were semistructured and somewhat more directed than in Phase 1. An initial general question on how the University has changed since 1991 requested the respondents' evaluation of changes, issues, and any outstanding or new concerns. Respondents were then queried on any issue identified as important in Phase 1 which they had not addressed. In addition, respondents were asked to provide an overall assessment of the University's current state as they viewed it.

Selection of Respondents

Given the nature of the investigation, it was decided that key informant interviews would be most appropriate. Borg and Gall (1989) defined key informants as "members of the group under study who have special knowledge or perceptions that are not otherwise available to the researcher" (p. 38). Field and Morse (1985) commented that "there are key people who have more insight . . . than others" and who are "more articulate than others" (p. 57). Some of these key informants held formal offices within the institution, while others did not.

Consideration was also given to the structure of the sample of key respondents. More specifically, it was seen to be important that we seek representation from a cross-section of groups within and outside the University. In addition, we would be sensitive to input from various disciplines. The literature on educational governance and leadership in universities generally distinguished between various constituencies, namely, (1) faculty, (2) deans, chairs, and heads, (3) the president's office (including vice-presidents), (4) non-academics and support, (5) students and graduate students, and (6) the board of governors and the senate (Millard, 1991). Our sample was thus constructed around these general groupings using the snowball sampling technique (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 64). Subjects (key informants) within each identified subgrouping were selected through referral from other subjects.

In this case, we began by consulting the President at our meeting with him. Respondents were selected on the basis of having been referred by more than one respondent. However, not everyone with multiple recommendations was interviewed. When there were choices to be made, they were made in such a manner as to ensure as broad a representation of the disciplines as possible (professions, sciences, arts, etc.). Care was also taken to ensure some measure of gender comprehensiveness.

In the final analysis, our sample for Phase 1 contained the following groupings:

- Executive leadership (President, Vice-Presidents, and associates)
- Intermediate leadership (deans, chairs, and associates)
- Faculty
- Non-academic and support
- Other—internal (graduate and undergraduate students, Board of Governors, Senate, retired senior administration), and
- Other—external (Department of Advanced Education senior personnel, retired cabinet minister, opposition politicians).

Each of our 25 interviews generally ran for at least 90 minutes. No person approached by us refused to be interviewed although some respondents initially appeared to be somewhat hesitant. Berg (1989) stressed "the importance of rapport in conducting interviews. One dominant theme in the literature centres on the interviewer's ability to develop rapport with an interview subject" (p. 29). Gauthier (1992) also stressed the importance of an appropriate rapport. Both interviewers were able to call upon their experience in interviewing to ensure that such a rapport was established and maintained. Where one of the researchers was acquainted with the respondent, he generally led the questioning. In cases where we were meeting the respondent for the first time, we began by discussing the nature of the study, the approach, etc., alternating from one to the other. The person who appeared to us to have the best rapport would then continue. There was no instance where we disagreed on our assessment of who had the best rapport. The other interviewer generally intervened later in the interview to seek clarification or expand on what had been said to that point.

As the interviews progressed, certain salient issues were identified. These issues were sometimes raised with subsequent respondents when it was felt appropriate to do so, but not before the respondent had completed his or her initial

response. In most cases, a majority of the issues raised previously were addressed by the respondents albeit from many different perspectives.

During the Phase 1 interviews it was clear that the vast majority of respondents had very informed and insightful perspectives on the issues and concerns facing the University as a whole. Since Phase 1, some of the respondents have moved on. Of the initial 25 respondents, however, a majority were still accessible in 1997. Although two Phase 1 respondents could not be interviewed (one because he refused, the second because of logistical problems), it was possible to interview 15 key informants, representing all six categories. Of the 15 respondents in Phase 2, two had not been interviewed in Phase 1. One was added because of his position in the University (the position being seen to be important), a second because of his broad experience in many aspects of university governance in the intervening years.

In Phase 1, informants were advised that researchers would be taking extensive notes. In Phase 2, permission was sought to record interviews and to transcribe them. In addition, the researcher kept a journal of field notes to record impressions which might be relevant in the analysis of the data (Borg & Gall, 1989).

Data Analysis

Merriam (1988) described data analysis as "the process of making sense" (p. 127). Data from the interviews were organized into categories using the open coding approach outlined in Strauss and Corbin (1990, pp. 72-74) and Deslauriers (1991, pp. 70-74).

The first step involved grouping responses according to the categories identified during the process of respondent selection. Responses in the executive leadership group were read a number of times, and the responses of one of the executive group were analyzed line by line. "This involves close examination,

phrase by phrase, and sometimes single words" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 77). Ideas were identified and grouped under themes, referred to by Deslauriers (1991) as "cores of meaning" (p. 70), and components of the framework for analysis began to emerge. The various themes were then grouped under general headings of "Internal Issues" and "External Issues." At that point, the internal issues themes were assigned to one of the three headings borrowed from Peterson (1987). The line-by-line analysis was carried to the next respondent in the executive leadership group, and the themes and subcategories were adjusted as we proceeded. As the review progressed, themes and subcategories were refined under the general headings. We then proceeded to the next group. Through line-by-line analysis and through multiple readings, the themes and categories were yet further refined. This iterative process was continued through the various categories of respondents until all the data had been incorporated into the classification framework, presented in Chapter 2 of this study. The framework that emerged from the data also drew on the review of the literature, which was ongoing during the analysis, and on the researchers' combined experience. Phase 2 data were classified according to the same framework, with the addition of a small section on resilience, a question not considered in Phase 1.

Once the classification instrument had been developed and the data classified, data were grouped by theme and subtheme and analyzed cell by cell to determine trends, consistencies, and inconsistencies. Inconsistencies were probed to determine whether they could be attributed to a particular group of respondents. Where possible, facts were verified through review of documentation. Conclusions were then drawn from the data, providing examples and illustrative quotes whenever possible.

When all the classification cells had been probed in this way and conclusions drawn in each of them, the results were reviewed several times to draw out broader summary conclusions. These conclusions in Phase 1 informed

the more structured portion of the interviews in Phase 2. Phase 1 (Chapter 4) and Phase 2 (Chapter 5) results were compared cell by cell and then overall to determine key findings and conclusions of the study, presented in Chapter 6.

Trustworthiness

Lincoln and Guba (1985) argued that different approaches to validity and reliability should be used in naturalistic research. They suggested that criteria of internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity be replaced with trustworthiness, including four main criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. These four criteria were addressed in the study.

Credibility

Lincoln and Guba (1986, p. 77) provided six guidelines for ensuring credibility, some of which did not apply to this study.

1. Prolonged engagement: This was not relevant for this study.

2. Persistent observation: During the period, I was at the University of Alberta as a student and as a part-time academic staff member of Faculté Saint-Jean (1992-4) which provided some perspectives on what was going on at the time. In a previous position with the Federal Government, I had had dealings with members of the executive leadership group around funding for special programs of studies, which also provided some information on decision making within the University.

3. Triangulation: A limited amount of cross-checking of data across sources was built into the design of the study. Whenever possible, facts were verified against documentary evidence (in the form of reports and committee minutes). In addition, some points were verified with administrative personnel who had been in attendance at specific committee meetings.

4. Peer debriefing: Peer debriefing was not specifically incorporated into the study. In Phase 1 of the study, however, my colleague's interview and field notes were reviewed and compared to my own to ensure consistency and accuracy.

5. Negative case analysis: Perceptions and documents were analyzed and common themes were identified. The researcher was aware at all times of possible negative cases which might point to alternative interpretations of the data. Differences in key informant perceptions and documentary data were considered and reported in the analysis of the data.

6. Member checks: Member checks were incorporated in that those persons interviewed in Phase 2 were asked to verify an overview of the principal points raised in their Phase 1 interview. Phase 2 respondents were also asked to confirm at the end of each interview that they were comfortable with their responses. One respondent asked to have part of the interview played back and instructed that certain comments be considered off-the-record and not reflected in the study.

Transferability

Transferability was recognized by Merriam (1988) as a problem that "has beset case study investigators for some time" (p. 173). Lincoln and Guba (1986) suggested that thick descriptive data be developed "so that judgements about the degree of fit or similarity may be made by others who may wish to apply all or part of the findings elsewhere" (p. 77).

Since this study is specific to the University of Alberta, it is not suggested that the findings are fully transferable. Nevertheless, universities do share many common characteristics as evidenced in studies by Leslie and Fretwell (1996) and Emberley (1996), among many others. Furthermore, thick description is provided in the background and analysis sections of this study, so that other post-secondary

institutions and government departments should be able, should they choose to do so, to make comparisons with or draw inferences for their own situations.

Dependability and Confirmability

Lincoln and Guba (1986, p. 77) replaced reliability and objectivity with dependability and confirmability. Merriam (1988) noted that the term "reliability in the traditional sense seems to be something of a misfit when applied to qualitative research" (p. 175). However, she went on to suggest that reliability could be enhanced through a clear audit trail for the study, i.e., a detailed account of approaches to data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Care was taken in describing the study to clearly outline what was done and in what manner. As well, assumptions underlying the study were presented as was some indication of the researchers' backgrounds and experience, both of which are relevant in interpretive inquiry.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for conducting this study was obtained from the Department of Educational Policy Studies. Prior to conducting Phase 1 interviews, the researchers familiarized themselves with the University of Alberta code of ethics with respect to human research. All respondents were informed that they were participating freely, that they could refuse to answer any and all questions, that they could terminate the interview at any time and that they could withdraw from the study. Each respondent signified his or her understanding of these conditions. In addition, respondents in Phase 1 were advised that both researchers would be taking extensive notes during the interview. Similar procedures were followed for Phase 2, in which respondents were also requested to agree to the interviews being taped and transcribed. All Phase 2 respondents agreed to be interviewed under those conditions. Respondents in both phases were assured of

confidentiality and comments provided "off the record" were not used except to inform the researchers' general understanding of the events or their interpretation. Comments which might be traceable to a particular individual and possibly cause the respondent some discomfort were not reported.

CHAPTER 4

PHASE 1 DATA ANALYSIS: THE 1991-2 PERSPECTIVE

Characteristics of the Interviewees

The 25 people interviewed during the first phase of the study were identified by colleagues and other respondents as being spokespersons and/or opinion leaders with representative views of some constituency within the University or without. In the interviews they demonstrated a high level of caring about the University and a high level of enthusiasm for the project. Only one interviewee asked that we not directly quote him.

Our interview sample was comprised of 19 men and 6 women, distributed according to Table 2. Efforts were made to ensure that a measure of comprehensiveness was achieved in terms of academic disciplines and gender.

TABLE 4

Distribution of Interviewees—Phase 1

Group	**Men**	**Women**
Executive Leadership	4	1
Intermediate Leadership	3	2
Faculty	4	0
Non-Academic and Support	1	2
Other—Internal	4	0
Other—External	3	1
Total	**19**	**6**

Classification of Responses

The classification instrument was broken down and refined to a level where the interviewee responses under each subheading were deemed to be manageable (usually the third level in the framework). The framework as it evolved is presented in Chapter 2 under the heading "Conceptual Framework." Many of the responses were assigned to more than one classification cell and they were considered in the analysis of each of those cells.

Detailed Findings

There was general agreement among the interviewees that the University was an "institution in transition" and that it was facing very difficult challenges. It was also widely perceived that change within the University of Alberta had largely been precipitated by the institution's financial difficulties.

While it was acknowledged that finances were the principal impetus behind changes in 1991, it was held that the University had far greater and deeper problems. There was also a recognition that the rate and pace of change in 1991 were unprecedented, that the University was being challenged to adapt, and that it had not been well equipped to do so. The detailed findings contain an identification and analysis of problems perceived to exist within the University at that time.

Internal

Governance

The classification of governance responses contains three principal groupings, namely nature of universities, general characteristics of the University of Alberta, and governance mechanisms.

The nature of universities. One person outside the University observed that "universities have three roles: teaching, research, some with practical

applicability, and community linkages and bridges, with some staff involved with or seconded to business, industry, etc."

Internal respondents saw the University as centred on knowledge. "It creates knowledge, interprets knowledge, and applies knowledge." There was, however, less direct reference in their comments to the community service and liaison aspect raised by external respondents. One academic staff member distinguished between "intellectualism and activism" and defined universities' role as being "to educate people to be intellectuals and not activists," a statement that can be seen to lend support to the view of universities as somewhat detached from most people's day-to-day reality. One external respondent similarly saw universities as detached from society, seeing them "as a place for people in society to withdraw into the monastery of knowledge." This somewhat ascetic view of universities may have contributed to the statement by two interviewees that universities were "somewhat elitist."

It was also observed that universities had grown very rapidly in the previous few years both in terms of programming and enrolments and that the growth had been made possible by generous public funding. This financial largesse was in turn seen to have contributed to the perceived independence of universities from society and government: "There is a propensity for all organizations to become independent in good times." Another respondent observed that "universities do not want to be seen to be run by or influenced by governments." This independence was seen by some respondents to have contributed to the perception that "universities operate in a vacuum."

One interviewee presented the University as a "two-headed beast, on the one hand well geared up for change, given its cutting-edge research capability; on the other, a medieval beast ruled by traditions of scholarship." Another respondent observed: "The enterprise is the way it is because it has been that way for a very long time. It contains many impediments to change, unlike anything found in large

private corporations." This dichotomy between the capacity of the University to be well prepared for change, particularly in its research capacity, and its extreme caution and aversion to change, appeared throughout the study as a recurring theme.

Universities were frequently presented as complex organizations. One respondent described the process of change as a movement from one balance point to another:

> Universities are complex systems in balance. There are certain points in the life of an organization where things move from one balance point to another. This transition can be frightening or liberating for those involved in it. The period of transition is time in parentheses. At present, we are at that point of moving from one balance point to a new homeostasis.

Universities appeared in the study as complex institutions involved in research, teaching, and to a lesser extent community service. They were perceived to be at the forefront in many areas through their research activities, while at the same time, being very conservative in approaching change.

General characteristics of the University of Alberta. Observations classified under "general characteristics" were numerous and diverse, hence a further level of classification was drawn from the data. It included five headings: status of the University, readiness for change, decision making, constituent relations, and vision and belonging.

1. Status of the University of Alberta. Several respondents saw the University of Alberta as having progressed greatly in the years preceding 1991. One respondent explained:

> Much progress has been made at the U of A in the past 10 to 15 years. The University has been maturing. One indicator of this has been the growth in research as a percentage of the University's grant from 15 to 17 percent to 31 percent currently.

Another respondent commented: "There is so much good here. We have one of the best universities in the country." Yet another observed: "The U of A is serving the province as a whole and it has a number of faculties which are unique in the province."

Many respondents were concerned that the University not lose the ground it was perceived to have gained over the years. "We are slipping due to our capital situation, lack of staff, etc."

2. Readiness for change. The consensus among respondents in Phase 1 of the study was that University of Alberta staff members' readiness for change had increased significantly since the restructuring had begun: "Presently, we have had shock therapy, there is more readiness for change, and people are thinking about adding and subtracting, rather than just adding." One interviewee attributed this newfound willingness to change to "a greater willingness to change in times of threat, real or perceived." Most respondents agreed that this willingness to look at things differently was present throughout much of the University. It was seen to follow that "most persons within the University have come to realize that it is not realistic to think that things will come around by themselves."

Notwithstanding this perceived openness of many individuals to change, most respondents felt that there were serious impediments to change. "There is a lot of built-in self-protection in the institution." One respondent characterized the culture of the organization as a "culture of resistance and a culture designed to withstand." Many respondents also worried that the "old boys' network," primarily, though not exclusively, at the department chair and dean levels, would squelch any initiative for change.

The 1991 fiscal situation was seen as having contributed greatly to individuals' willingness to tolerate or even to embrace change. Several respondents presented the situation as a struggle between the forces for change and the forces of inertia within the University.

3. Decision making. Decision making was widely seen as a key issue within the University of Alberta, and it was presented as a very complex problem. The collegial nature of decision making was seen to present challenges which had not been adequately addressed, with a resultant undermining of both collegiality and decision making within the institution. Collegiality was also seen as being under attack from the competitive models within the University, principally evidenced through the nature of reward systems emphasizing individual achievement, and through competition among colleagues for limited research funding.

Decision making at the University was also presented as overly democratic. "The value-based call is that all has to be done democratically. There comes a time when hard decisions have to be made. The University culture is not suited for that kind of activity." This democratized decision making was seen to constitute a serious limitation for the President: "For the President to say 'here's what we're doing' and send a memo and expect it to happen is foolishness." Another respondent commented that "the organizational chart is useless to look at."

One respondent coined the phrase "decision paralysis" to describe a situation whereby competing interests in a decision making forum were unable to arrive at an accommodation. This was seen to create opportunities for senior administration to step in and dictate their wishes, as, it was perceived, had been the case in the February 1991 changes. The absence of a mechanism other than top-down decision making to resolve these instances of decision paralysis, for example, a mediation process, was also seen as a liability for the collegial decision making model in place. One respondent worried that when decisions were made, too many compromises occurred and that the quality of decision making had suffered as a result.

4. Constituent relations. The University was perceived to "have done terribly in its role with government." As evidence, one respondent commented that

"Giving universities two to three percent less has to do with a specific choice, the government's decision." Another observed that the University was having little influence in government decision making and concluded that "our relationship with government is not good enough."

While the University of Alberta was seen to have gained status in the past few years, it was felt that it had not yet attained the status that would ensure its continued full funding: "If we were truly a Harvard, it would be very hard for this government not to support the University generously."

The communication problem was seen to extend beyond the University's rapport with government: "We suffer from a profile problem. We seem to have forgotten how to communicate with people." One interviewee called for the University "to get out of the closet." Another commented that "lots of people in the community have valid concerns, but are not being listened to: we would need to lose that." A number of those interviewed presented the University as detached from its various external constituents—adjoining neighbourhoods, communities, politicians, government departments, and the general public—with the result that its dependence on government funding was maintained and its ability to mount support for its plight seriously compromised.

5. Vision and belonging. The absence of a clear unifying vision for the University was seen to have contributed to some units lacking connectedness to common University goals and aspirations. Certain organizational units within the University were seen to be excessively autonomous: "The engineering program does not include courses from the rest of the University. As long as they don't make use of their affiliation, there is no justification in having them in there." This lack of connectedness of certain units to the University was seen to constitute "fiefdoms" within the University. This was attributed in part to the rapid expansion of the institution without appropriate efforts to conceptually integrate new units into the University's mission and objectives. As one interviewee

commented, "the U of A responded to every political trend that came along." Examples cited included Women's Studies and Ukrainian Studies, both of which were seen by several respondents to be unwise expansion decisions.

Several respondents also blamed political decision making for the absence of central vision, indicating that governments should not mandate the creation of new departments or programs that did not fit within the University's future plans. At the same time, several respondents spoke of increasing pride in and loyalty to the University. "Don't underestimate the commitment of the people in the organization."

Governance mechanisms. Interviewees saw constituent groups as placing their own interests well above those of the University. Further, conflict was seen to exist between administration, faculty, non-academics, and the Board, and between organizational units within the University. The responses in this section are grouped under three headings: characteristics, roles, and relationships.

1. Characteristics. Governance was presented as very diffuse with a strong reliance on a complex network of formal committees and administrative policies. One respondent presented impressions on first studying decision making structures within the University:

> Compared to many other universities, it is really a very policy-driven university. I was just reading something about the more prestigious the University, the more academically renowned the University, the less it tends to feel that it needs to write its policies down. When I got through these documents, I said there are only two things that a dean can do: the dean has the power of appointment after many committees, but the committees are advisory, and it is not really said there, but I assume the dean has the power of budget allocation. This is true: those are the only two things a dean has. Everything else is, supposedly, done by committee.

Another respondent called for less administration, and fewer rules and GFC policies. The University of Alberta appeared as largely governed by a complex

committee structure which was seen by many to be more effective in blocking decisions than in making them.

2. Roles. The Senate was presented as largely irrelevant in the governance of the University although it was acknowledged that lately it had become "a bit more useful." The Board of Governors, on the other hand, was seen to be playing a much more active and direct role in the governance of the University in 1991 than it had in previous years. It was presented as pushing "the imposition of a business model with more checks and balances." The Board was also presented as unpopular with faculty members for its stances on such topics as tenure.

Several respondents felt that the President's authority was largely constrained by the governance structure, and it was suggested that this had contributed to decision paralysis within the University. "Strong leadership and sound decision making" were presented as a means of breaking through this paralysis.

Student involvement in formal governance processes was presented as very good. "As participants on the Priorities and Planning Committee, student representatives could have as much impact as anybody there." It was recognized, however, by the student respondents and others, that student representatives needed to be very adept at administrative politics if they hoped to be heard.

A majority of respondents saw the positions of chair and dean to be "the most critical positions." Ironically, the position of chair was also seen to be a "thankless job." In addition, "Deans and chairs are rarely asked to make choices that ask them to put on their university-wide hats," an unfortunate situation given their central role. Administration in general was viewed as largely unattractive to most academics.

The committee structure was identified as being central to all manner of decision making within the University. General Faculties Council (GFC) was seen by some as the central forum for governance of the University and by others as "an

ineffective organization that blocks things." One respondent specifically recommended that the committee structure be reviewed in terms of mandates and membership with a view to streamlining decision making.

Non-academic staff involvement in governance was seen by the non-academic respondents and by some in the internal groups to be too limited: "In an academic setting, faculty committees have representatives from all constituencies affected by the faculties except non-academic staff." Processes in place for cuts to academic positions were contrasted with processes for administrative personnel. The safeguards for academic cuts were presented as far more extensive than for non-academic staff. Non-academic participation on the Board of Governors was not permitted until the former President successfully pointed out to the Board that the permissive nature of the legislation did not preclude their involvement.

In conclusion, the committee structure appeared as a major impediment to effective decision making. It further appeared from the comments of many respondents that they were highly dissatisfied with leaders' abilities to move decisions through these committee structures. One respondent felt that more decisions should be made by administrators, in line with more conventional bureaucratic models. This respondent was very visibly frustrated with "the system" and expressed very forceful opinions. Most respondents, however, favored a revised, more functional committee structure over the hierarchical model.

3. Relationships. Relationships within the governance structure of the University were presented by many respondents as more adversarial than collegial. "There is a conflict between Board committees and academic-dominated committees." "There are more adversarial issues involving Boards versus [academic] staff versus students." As one respondent commented rather colorfully: "We should be working together, not pissing on each other's shoes."

A number of respondents saw the Board of Governors as an extension of the provincial government—a conduit for the government agenda. Student representatives tended to applaud the Board's calls for enhanced accountability from faculties and academic staff and more emphasis on quality teaching. One respondent viewed the President and Vice-Presidents as spending "a lot of time second-guessing the Board." Others felt that the President had not played a strong enough role in "educating" Board members on academic issues.

The "decision paralysis" brought about in part by the cumbersome committee structure was seen to present opportunities for the President and Vice-Presidents to assume greater leadership. Several respondents perceived that this had not happened other than through the February 1991 document (Maintaining Excellence and Accessibility in an Environment of Budgetary Restraint), which they saw as highly suspect in terms of its underlying logic and the processes through which it was approved. One respondent claimed to have "proof" that information had been deliberately manipulated to support positions being put forward, and that affected faculties had not been aware of that manipulation.

Despite the obvious commitment of faculty respondents, they expressed frustration with the committee structure. They reported often feeling that their efforts at reform and change were being sabotaged in committee structures; this led many to experience considerable frustration with "the system," with some of their colleagues intent on the status quo, and with those in leadership positions within the University, whose ultimate responsibility it was seen to be to make necessary changes.

Management

Comments relating to management in general appeared to fall into three main categories, namely resources, strategic issues, and outputs. Within each of these three areas a number of subcategories were also identified.

Resources. Five subgroupings are included: budgets and financial assets, physical assets, personnel, management practices, and accountability and openness.

1. Budgets and financial assets. At the time the interviews for Phase 1 were conducted, the initial round of selective cuts had been announced by the new President. The first impression that emerged from the data was that most of the changes being proposed and implemented in the University of Alberta in 1991 were fiscally driven, reactive responses. These changes were seen by many to be inconsistent with sound planning, sound financial management practices, and sound educational imperatives.

There was also agreement that government-imposed fiscal restraint was not a passing fad and that its consequences would be far-reaching, given the University's high level of reliance on public funding. Many saw the need to diversify and expand the revenue base. One respondent noted that, in typical fashion, fundraising had only become an important priority after the first major government cutbacks. Generally, respondents were skeptical about the University's capacity to replace public funding with private money. They also recognized that donors "don't want to pay operating costs" and that certain faculties "are a hard sell, for example Arts and Humanities."

One respondent reported having been involved in a very successful fundraising campaign on campus and found it to be a positive experience. Another summarized what he had learned about fundraising: "The message is that there is no benevolent giving. People are looking for wise investments. They will only

invest once and they will pick the best." A few interviewees indicated that most people on campus did not know much about fundraising.

Several respondents questioned how well the resources of the University were being managed. The following statements give a flavor of what was said: "The source of some problems is how we manage;" "Limited resources are not being used to full potential." And further, "There is little use getting more money if you can't use it effectively." It was also noted that administration had been growing faster than any other part of the University.

Several respondents saw endowments as a mixed blessing. "All tied moneys go to designated areas. The money is not available elsewhere and putting it into general revenues is a breach of trust." One interviewee's comment summarized many of the feelings on the issue: "Endowments are wrong in a sense that you have an elephant to feed but no elephant food. We need some way of being more flexible."

The existence of University land holdings, particularly the University farm, was presented as both an asset and a liability. Several interviewees worried that these holdings had been viewed as valuable assets which could be liquidated, thereby adversely affecting the University's levels of funding from government. There was consensus among those raising the issue that it would be a mistake for the University to sell those assets and that it was likewise a mistake for the government to factor them into an assessment of the University's financial position.

The identification of targeted cuts, referred to as vertical cuts, in opposition to past across-the-board or horizontal cuts, was seen to be largely an initiative of the President and Vice-President (Academic), referred to by one respondent as "the Prince." A number of respondents viewed the declaration of a state of financial exigency in 1991 simply as a means of cutting administrative officer and faculty positions.

It was also reported that some cuts to administrative service units within the University were being internally downloaded to academic departments in the form of increased service charges. "Departments feel that they have been hit twice (once through reduced funding, the second time through increased service charges)." One respondent saw the increases to service charges as leading to contracting out. She worried that the money going off campus as a result of this contracting out represented a serious problem for the University. She was also concerned that service to the University would suffer as a result.

Not everyone perceived the cuts to be entirely negative. "Maybe funding cuts will shake the place up, not a bad thing." Another interviewee reported a greater level of involvement and cooperation in decision making since the imposition of the budgetary cuts.

It was noted that there was not much knowledge of the budgeting process among university staff members. Others reported that there was a tendency by everyone being affected to feel that they had been more harshly treated than everyone else.

2. Physical assets. Two problems were presented with respect to the age of the University. The first related to the cost of maintenance. "The physical plant was built 30 to 40 years ago. The higher maintenance costs are contributing to the downward spiral." The second, also related to the age of buildings on campus, concerned the appropriateness of facilities. "The spaces created at that time are inappropriate for some new needs." One interviewee estimated the cost of required building upgrades at $50 to $60 million.

Equipment in many cases was said to be out of date. "Our [equipment] is 18 years old. A vice-president of a major company ridiculed it." It was put forward that a university aspiring to first-class status must have the latest equipment. "We are falling behind. The U of A has been an average institution over the past few years. There is a degree of apathy relative to first-class status."

The aging of equipment was seen to be a liability when attempting to attract and retain competent staff and outstanding students.

It was further noted that "Turfism can be exacerbated by capital cutbacks." One interviewee described a strategy "whereby all classrooms were brought under faculty control and outfitted for everyone's use. We can't afford people being isolated. All faculty offices are interrelated with one computer system, central printer locations, better use of equipment." It was felt that this centralized control had had very positive results in maintaining a faculty-wide focus for all its constituent departments and that it had brought about greater cooperation among departments.

The deterioration of the physical plant and equipment at the University, the inappropriateness of some spaces for some new needs, and the failure to effectively manage existing spaces were all seen to be issues at the University. The aging of equipment was seen to be contributing to a perceived erosion of the University's status as a first-class institution. Several interviewees felt that the University of Alberta had been treated unfairly relative to the University of Calgary, particularly in terms of its residences. Government support for the University of Calgary had been more generous while "we are left to struggle with long-term mortgages on deteriorating residences."

3. Personnel. It was clear throughout the interviews that "the number and complexity of problems related to people have increased dramatically." One respondent commented on personnel management practices within the University: "People search desperately for simple solutions [to problems with faculty and staff]: it is not simple." As a result "our legal bills tend to be much higher than they should be or were." Examples of identified issues included increased incidences of stress-related disability, distrust of administration around the real motives behind the restructuring, mandatory retirement, staff aging, sagging morale, and work site harassment.

Non-academic staff felt particularly hard-hit by the cuts imposed on the University and they felt that the restructuring exercise had exacerbated tensions between academic and non-academic staff.

> Many highly trained and highly paid technicians were laid off with an average length of service of 10 to 12 years. The moral issue here is that these staff members are narrowly focussed by virtue of their specialized training. The University has recognized that they owe these people, in terms of retraining.

The insecurity created among remaining staff was also cited as a serious problem.

Non-academic respondents indicated that "a lot of mistrust has been generated over the past three to four years." In particular, respondents commented on the attitudes of middle managers, who were seen to be autocratic and insensitive to non-academic staff concerns.

It was also noted that many support staff positions had been eliminated. It was felt that "They are restructuring people who are faceless." A lack of parity with wages in the private sector was cited as contributing to layoffs: "Some support staff are paid 47 to 80 percent higher than their private sector counterparts in such areas as housing, food, electricians, plumbers, etc., partly due to their length of service." Also, one interviewee reported that support staff were not being utilized to their full capacity in departmental and faculty initiatives.

Academic respondents also complained of poor morale stemming from insecurity. "The worst thing for morale is insecurity, where people don't know. Increasingly on campus, that is the case." Respondents expressed concern that not enough was being done to "help people grow." People were seen increasingly to be specializing, a change perceived to be accompanied by a shift from a collegial mode to a more competitive one. This tended to make them less mobile and flexible, and more vulnerable in times of restructuring. "The University has to help people grow or they will be superannuated. This should be an expectation of

work at the University." Notwithstanding the lack of opportunities for growth provided by the University, it was also noted that faculty were not naturally drawn to change. "Faculty are the most conservative people in the world."

Academics in their mid-40s were seen to be most vulnerable: "They are feeling pressure from both sides, constantly fighting for research dollars, struggling to establish research programs, competing with energetic youth and trying to keep up with the old dogs." In addition, "They feel considerable pressure to assume administrative roles. The young are not yet there, the old are beyond this." One respondent noted that this group also tended to have heavier teaching loads which made them more vulnerable to burnout.

Although it was acknowledged that "tenured staff are protected and there is a small likelihood that a person cannot be repositioned in the organization," it was perceived by several respondents that tenure was under attack and that there had been a rise in the terminations of tenured academic staff. This latter perception appeared to have been exacerbated by the general insecurity surrounding the cutbacks.

Several issues were also raised with respect to the quality of management at the University. Several respondents commented that "Some academic stars are terrible administrators." Others felt that some persons in leadership positions "do not have the will nor the skill to make changes." This "will and skill" problem was raised by several respondents as a key issue. In particular, "the old boys" were seen as conservative, negative, and largely incompetent, while "the new group" was seen to be more flexible, open-minded, and skilled, but lacking the strength and support to challenge the power of "the old boys." Some of the management problems were also attributed to structural causes: "The Chair of English has 70 recommendations to make on increments." And further: "There are not a lot of incentives for dealing with underachievers." It was pointed out that "Termination cases are difficult: there are a lot of complex procedural issues." It was felt that

personnel difficulties further exacerbated the natural disinclination of academics to become involved in administration. As a result, "It is difficult to get good people to do these jobs."

Notwithstanding, several respondents felt that "the current reward system can function effectively. Everything is there." Support was expressed for enhancing evaluation processes and encouraging deans to be more forceful in administering rewards. "We are moving clearly to a stronger focus on discriminating in rewards."

It was also felt that more training should be provided to administrators. "The question of academic administrators is important; you should not place academics in administrative positions without support on how to be an administrator. No training ends up being a waste of time and you end up in the courts." This was further reinforced by a person in intermediate leadership: "There are no shortcuts: you have to understand agreements and you do have to know the rules."

A common complaint of the executive leadership group was overwork and lack of time. One respondent in the group cited a "very substantial workload" and complained of a lack of "thinking time." This respondent summarized the group's feelings: "Finding time to do as good a job as I would like is a problem." In contrast, another member of that group found that "there is lots of time here to discuss vision, philosophies, etc." Despite this dissonant voice, the picture of this group as being "run off our feet" still emerged quite strongly.

Overall, respondents tended to see problems and solutions from one of three perspectives. Some felt that the governance system needed to be changed. Others believed that the priority should be to change the management approach (i.e., more effectively managing what was already in place). A third group believed that there was a need to change the people in the organization. People advocating changes to the governance structure tended to be more discouraged and more negative than

those espousing the other two approaches. The first group appeared overwhelmed by the institutional resistance to change and by the structural "decision paralysis" of the current system. The other two groups tended to be more positive and optimistic.

Several respondents in the second group advocated that more time be spent on personnel management issues: "One-tenth of the time spent on budgets should be spent on rewards, firing, etc. Then we wouldn't have a problem." One dean spoke of a participative approach to reforming one particular faculty's reward system. In that faculty, small units were allowed to define merit and establish standards for merit recommendations. "As a result, there have been dramatic changes in merit recommendations in recent years: morale has gone up." This dean felt that trust between faculty and administration had greatly increased as a result. One non-academic staff member from the same faculty suggested that "the human resources mechanism could break down fiefdoms if it were used appropriately." The leitmotiv of this second group tended to be: "We have all the mechanisms, procedures, policies, rewards, etc., to make this place extraordinary."

The third group saw diversity as a means to bringing about change within the University and they recommended that steps be taken, for example, employment equity programs, to attract representatives of a greater cross-section of the community. Not surprisingly, this view attracted strong opinions on both sides. "There are people at both ends of the continuum and a whole group in the middle." One apparent voice of reason called for "a strategy which isn't unfair; we need to talk and have a plan." The strongest advocates of this "people solution" tended to see the composition of university staff as the solution to most of the University's problems. Advocates of this doctrine of diversity argued that if "the composition of staff broadly represented the community, that will change the way things are done." "We need people with different approaches. People have tended to come from narrow perspectives." It was further argued that this was

necessary because of the increasing complexity of the problems being faced. It was also felt that management structures would change as more diversity was added. "What the whole thing would do is predispose to change." The principal advocate of this group was quick to point out that the "old boys' network" was still very strong and that "you can't go in a direction against all others." Supporters of government policies on diversity would find much in common with the approach being advocated by this group.

All of these three approaches were centred on people: the first would rely heavily on leadership at all levels in the institution, including faculty and the Board, to reshape governance mechanisms; the second largely on deans and chairs in more effectively managing the mechanisms in place; and the third, on the effects of greater diversity among faculty in the institution. In summary, the first approach advocates changing governance mechanisms; the second, making existing mechanisms work; and the third combines both of these approaches but relies on the diversification of organizational demographics to achieve the desired results. It would seem reasonable to affirm that all three approaches have merit, and action would be required on all three fronts. Whatever the solution espoused, there was a general consensus that "people issues" were important in the institution and that they were generally not being effectively addressed.

4. Management practices. There was an alarmingly widespread consensus among those interviewed that the University's management was below acceptable standards. Several blanket statements were made condemning the quality of management at the University. "The University is not well managed." "The source of some problems is how we manage."

Some respondents saw the decision making process as the main problem: "Decision paralysis is faced on a lot of difficult questions where we have to or should make a decision." This inertia was captured in an anecdote from one of the interviewees. The respondent approached others at the same level in the

University to discuss the possibility of taking preemptive action to forestall the potential merger of their respective units as identified in the February 1991 restructuring document (their units had been identified as under review). The proposal was to look to a new organizational form "not separate or collapsed but something in the middle." The response was a flat refusal to discuss any such arrangement.

One interviewee felt that compromises were the preferred method of decision making at the University. "I believe that there are right and wrong decisions and that compromises are sometimes necessary, but always making compromises will lead to trouble." The same interviewee went on: "I am not interested in democratic processes; I am interested in leadership and sound decision making." The conservative nature of faculty members was blamed for a lack of "gutsy decisions." The failure to act in a decisive way was seen as potentially having serious and immediate consequences. "Government has no role in closing programs: they only did that because they felt the University administration was incompetent."

A number of administrative policy shortcomings within the University were highlighted. It was reported that there was no policy in place with respect to indirect research costs. These costs were most often not covered in research grants "which can result in beggaring from areas without sponsored research." It was noted that "this has to be addressed or you get killed by your own success [in getting research grants]." Also lacking was a policy on "how funds from private or corporate donors were taken and used: we should have had priorities." One respondent worried that if academics were "left to their own devices [in developing private sector partnerships], there would be lots of opportunities to abuse the system and make deals." It was felt that "ground rules and careful policies" would be needed. This did not speak well of the perceived level of professional responsibility of faculty. With appropriate guidelines in place, it was

felt that a carefully planned and well-managed fundraising initiative could have very positive consequences, for instance in helping to sharpen a faculty's focus and in building morale through successes.

Other problems in relation to administrative policies were also presented. One respondent criticized "the lack of a capital plan in relation to salaries." More specifically, she described a situation whereby budget regulations allowed transfers from salaries to capital and maintenance without rigorous reporting of such changes. Also, salary accounting practices were seen to be inaccurate: "You can't tell how much money is being spent on non-academic salaries." It was further acknowledged that "The University leadership has a tremendous job to create a workable resource allocation system in line with overall objectives and in a reasonably planned way." The budgeting for ancillary technical departments also seemed to be poorly thought out.

> They provide a service to the University as a whole. Their staff are subject to the same contractual arrangements as other staff. When salaries increase, they have to make up the difference on their own. . . . Salary increases mean either layoffs or increased charges.

It was also argued that this would lead to contracting out and further loss of jobs.

Other management practices were also identified as deficient: "There is no coordination between budgets, and statistics and personnel." "The registrar's computers are not up-to-date." "There is no performance measurement."

Paradoxically, though it was seen to be deficient in several areas of management practices, the University was also seen to be paralyzed by over-regulation, particularly at General Faculties Council, and by an overabundance of committee structures.

5. Accountability and openness. Two types of accountability were identified: external public accountability (including system-wide and institution-specific accountability), and internal institutional accountability.

External accountability was seen as important for relations with both government and the public. "We need to educate the public to the fact that their tax dollars are being well spent." Also, the province had been encouraging universities to provide more performance measurement data: "The last two budget calls from government to institutions have asked for performance measures." A number of those interviewed felt that some of the information provided to the province could be made public by the University as a means of stimulating public discussion on the University's role in society and the level of support available to it.

Rather than cooperate with efforts to enhance accountability within the University, some persons were seen to be obstructing them. One interviewee recalled some faculties' reactions to the activities of the President's Advisory Committee on Campus Review (PACCR), an internal mechanism charged with reviewing university faculties and recommending enhancements: "With the PACCR process, some approached it as adversarial, some saw it as an exciting time to take stock and fly."

Several interviewees insisted on the need "to get the community involved in developing accountability policies and measures." Public forums, etc., although time-consuming, were seen to be essential to enhancing the perceived level of accountability of the University with the public. Student interviewees felt that "Progress is being made internally, although it still takes a conscious effort to find out what is going on."

Strategic issues. The strategic issues theme is comprised of five subcomponents: strategic planning, focus of education, student needs, accessibility, and tenure.

1. Strategic planning. Planning was perceived to be a problem within the University. "Uniformly, there is a sense that there is no plan, or a hastily put together plan." One respondent felt that some faculty believed that there was "a

central Machiavellian plan" which caused many people to distrust the administration. But the majority subscribed to the view that there was no central plan in the University, despite the avowed importance of such a plan. Most interviewees viewed the February 1991 document, Maintaining Excellence and Accessibility in an Environment of Budgetary Restraint, as "totally reactive." One respondent commented at not being surprised at the lack of thoughtful planning since "people who gain ascendency in tough fiscal times are not the thinkers."

It was argued that historically the University had been "better at adding things than subtracting things." The challenge appeared to be to "restructure the University in such a way that it may be flexible and not just attritional." Incrementalism, not planning, was seen as the main characteristic of the University's period of growth. Some saw this incrementalism as the by-product of pressures from a number of interest groups. "The rise of a host of interest groups in society has taken over from the thoughtful opinions of citizens." "The U of A handled every political trend that came along." It was interesting to note how Maclean's (1997) described the University in its annual rating system issue: "Eclectic comes close to describing it" (p. 74). Those interviewed in 1991 were more direct. "We need to get more focussed." "We can't be all things to all people." "We can't keep everything." "Universities can't undertake to fund all programs." "We no longer do windows." These few quotes give a sense of the perceived absence of focus in the University.

While it was acknowledged that it was difficult to plan in a time of deep fiscal restraint, there was also a belief among most interviewees that change was possible to a greater extent than in the past. But change would only be successful if it were undertaken correctly. "Having our backs to the wall can't be the only reason for change. Change should be academically, philosophically, and pedagogically driven." One interviewee said:

> We have some innovative and very current programs which are responding to societal interests but we have no budgets. Maybe we need to look at entrenched programs, indeed we are being forced into it. We are having to reevaluate and, so doing, I am not sure that they are being evaluated in the way in which they should be evaluated.

Again, there was concern that consideration of changes not be undertaken too "conservatively." "We have to be modern-thinking and gutsy and we have to be prepared to fail."

Another interviewee summarized much of the discontent around the February 1991 document.

> Leaders need to have a plan in place for 5 to 10 years and a vision for the next 25. Instead we struggle from one year to the next. Other than balancing the budget there is no vision for the future. All internal memos are number-crunching stuff—no strategic plan. Our current position is 180 degrees from The Next Decade and Beyond. The last cuts were made on the rationale of the number of undergraduates per teaching staff. The first memo from Davenport [the president] calculated the full-time equivalency of students, a simplistic approach. We had a new philosophy overnight. The process is not a scientific, logical process; it is suspect. The process was not a discussion. They decided and the system was rigged.

The Next Decade and Beyond, the long-term plan approved in 1987, was seen by many as not being a true strategic plan but rather as a document which "supported the view that the University could be all things to all people." The suspect nature of the process of approval of the 1991 document Maintaining Excellence and Accessibility in an Environment of Budgetary Restraint was mentioned by three respondents. The Board was also seen to be an important player in the February restructuring: "The University has to determine its own fate, not some successful entrepreneurs on the Board."

A few persons commented on the external environmental forces supporting changes in the University. "The impact on advanced education institutions of lifelong learning processes is forcing them to diversify their approaches." "There

are larger societal questions, for example, the number of doctors or dentists that we need." "Some things are beyond the University and even North America. They reverberate into Canada."

It was clear from the interviews that the strategic direction of the University was unclear in 1991 and that the February document, Maintaining Excellence and Accessibility in an Environment of Budgetary Restraint, was not seen to be consistent with acceptable planning processes. Nor was it seen to be linked in any way to the mission of the University or the strategic plan in place. Nor did it appear to contribute to clarifying the mission or mandate of the University. Furthermore, the process that led to its adoption was viewed as highly suspect. Rather it was seen as no more than an attempt to balance the books on the strength of flimsy and unclear criteria. And after its approval, the mission statement of the University was no clearer than before.

2. Focus of education. Respondents worried that the focus of the education which the University provided was shifting from a broader liberal perspective to a narrow training one. Respondents supported the former as more appropriate for the modern workplace. "There are no more lifetime jobs. We need flexible people." "We must give students the skills to do many jobs and be better members of society." One respondent saw a core liberal arts content and a research capability as differentiating between university programs and training programs at other levels.

3. Student needs. The principal point put forward was that the University had to pay more attention to students in its operations. "Students are paying a larger percentage of the cost of their education which will change some of the ways some faculties have treated students from processes of admission to clear and open standards." One respondent spoke of "consumer satisfaction" in relation to students' experience on campus.

Some approaches to teaching were seen as unproductive.

> We need to change the way education is dispensed. There was a movement to make students more independent. Nothing came of it although it was discussed. . . . Another unproductive thing is a lecture theatre that holds 500 students. That is far too large.

One respondent pointed out that "new teaching methods require that teachers have time to learn to teach that way." One academic staff member commented that "Academic advising is lousy at this university; students are perceived as a bit of a nuisance." Another academic member worried that "academic degrees are no longer attracting the best graduate students." This difficulty in recruiting the best graduate students was also being experienced in the sciences. "We have a problem attracting graduate students. Although we have the most graduate students of any [name of Faculty] in Canada, most are foreign students." One important aspect of the problem appeared to be the levels of support available to students.

4. Accessibility. Several respondents stated that "in North America, there is a high percentage of people going to university." The view of education as a means of upward social mobility was supported: "Canadian parents expect accessible education. Tuition fee increases are all wrong, they accentuate class differences." Equity in other areas was also seen as a positive objective: "Within the University we need to create an equitable environment for students. This includes developing a place for minority groups, a comfortable environment, making sure they develop skills."

Several respondents commented that the University had to become much more active in lifelong learning as a result of changing workplace realities. It was felt that mature students in the workplace would have different service expectations than did the more traditional student population.

Another respondent raised issues with respect to access for part-time students: "We have to accommodate people who can't be here on a full-time basis, for example, young women who are juggling families, careers, and education."

Only one interviewee mentioned residency requirements. "We need a two-year residency requirement [for graduate programs]; otherwise we are defrauding the students." Another wondered how far one could go in facilitating access to graduate programs "before you are into deluding yourself that you actually have a graduate program."

Support for students was seen to be flagging: "We need broader-based loan and grant programs." "Summer employment programs have been cut back by 20 to 25 percent." "Barriers must be removed for the poor."

While there was strong support for equitable access regardless of race, gender, disability, or income level, some reservations were expressed relative to universal access. No fewer than six respondents questioned access for certain students, despite recognizing what one respondent called the "democratic appeal of openness." "University isn't for everyone. It's not an extension of high school as a right: you have to earn access." One interviewee questioned the motives of some of the students: "Lots of kids want to get into the University not so much to get educated, but to get credentialed. . . . No credentials amounts to no job." Another interviewee advocated a program consisting of one initial year not unlike the CEGEPs (Collèges d'études générales et professionnelles) in Quebec. "We have a high dropout rate when we get direct input from high schools."

The question of enrolment management was presented as important.

> The former Vice-President of Athabasca University provided leadership in having universities face up to the problems of an increased desire for a university-type education. He warned that we would have no one to blame but ourselves if policies were set from the outside.

It was also noted that "Advanced Education is making its own decisions, for instance, in raising quotas in business." Enrolment management within the University was cited as yet another example of poor management. "Our enrolment management consisted of mixed messages which confused students and caused

agony to everyone. Quotas went from the top of every agenda to being forgotten. The new admission policy is not based on scientific analysis of any data."

One faculty developed a strategy aimed at ensuring longer term support for the University:

> In [name of faculty] we have a welcoming ceremony to celebrate how lucky we both are. . . . When students exit, we speak of their responsibility, their privilege, that the value of their degree is only as good as where we are. We tell them that we need them to help us.

Interviewee comments on restricting access were consistent with calls for the University to sharpen its focus. The reminder that the University could not be all things to all people reoccurred throughout as an important theme.

5. Tenure. An editorial in the Edmonton Journal dated February 8, 1992, described the issue of tenure from the perspective of the Board.

> Tenure has been traditionally granted to university professors after a four or five year probationary period as a way to protect academic freedom and to ensure they can be dismissed only for just cause. . . . However tenure has also come to be perceived by the public as absolute job security even in the face of mediocre performance. . . . Milner [Board Chair] said the University needs the same two things businesses need today: the ability to be flexible and the ability to bring in changes, or new products, quickly. (p. 8)

While there was general agreement among respondents that tenure was necessary to protect academics and to ensure a "competitive capacity for recruitment," it was acknowledged that tenure was a contentious matter. One respondent argued that "tenure has become a symbol in a power struggle between academics and the Board." As a result "there is a tendency to close ranks and defend the indefensible," which was seen to exacerbate the problem. "Both the term and the mythology that go with it are very difficult. . . . In the last six months, tenure is raised more and more as an issue to confront. . . . Tenure is who blinks first."

The biggest problem with tenure was perceived to be the manner in which it was managed within the University. "Tenure as applied here is a disincentive for growth. The original reason was OK but we have gone beyond that. One tenured staff member was selling real estate." Hence, abuse of privilege appeared to be the biggest problem along with an inability or unwillingness to deal with mediocre performance. "There are not a lot of incentives for dealing with underachievers." As in many organizations, the liability for persons in leadership of finding themselves in court appeared to far outweigh the benefits of tackling a problem of mediocre performance of a tenured faculty member.

Notwithstanding, one interviewee described how changing the application of the merit recommendation system in the interviewee's faculty had brought about an increase in morale. "Small units within the University define merit: we used a participative approach for our staff to establish the standards." It was noted that the frequency of tenured staff being released had increased, despite the numerous institutional and external impediments to doing so.

Another respondent described how the President rationalized tenure: "The nature of the job is such that membership is a long, tedious process. The economic argument is that low entry levels are eventually offset by tenure." The ability of this argument to placate Board criticisms of tenure as job security appeared to be highly suspect to that respondent.

As in much of the literature, criticisms of tenure appeared more as criticisms of the management of tenure and the academic responsibility of faculty. Tenure was presented as a symbolic prize in a power struggle between the Board and faculty, which the Board had no chance of winning, given the venerable history of tenure and the requirement that it exist for recruiting and other purposes. It was felt by respondents that the considerable energy spent arguing the merits of tenure might well have been more appropriately expended on improving assessment practices and the application of reward systems within the University.

Tenure also appeared as a major contributor to strained relations between the Board of Governors and faculty.

Outputs. The outputs grouping comprised four subcomponents: research, research and teaching, quality, and community needs and service.

1. Research. Respondents' comments supported the need for research on the full "continuum from basic to commercialization." Basic research, not unlike tenure, was seen by some respondents to be "romanticized" and to be "less of an issue than is often perceived." In addition, there was general support for more of a qualitative approach to assessing research "as opposed to the number of articles generated." The difficulty in securing funding for basic research was seen to be increasing: "Basic and fundamental research that does not catch the public eye is out of luck."

The longer timelines for basic university research were also commented on: "University research takes 15 to 20 years to reach completion: private sector time frames are 3 to 6 years." One respondent observed that "Research at the University versus development in the private sector will continue to be an issue. Some research should be done at the University."

Interviewees saw both benefits and pitfalls to increased private sector involvement in the funding of research. The U.S. was cited as an example of formal cooperation between universities and the private sector which had greatly benefitted universities. On the other hand, some interviewees worried that basic research might suffer in the long run, given the private sector's propensity to fund "products that are close to being moved to a viable business commodity." One interviewee worried that the University was far too involved in commercial ventures and saw it as "caving in to industrialization." There was also a worry that some academics were using the University to fund lucrative product development to supplement their incomes and establish private business ventures.

Privately funded research appeared as an example of poor policy development within the University. One respondent provided a list of criteria for consideration by the University before involving itself in a research project:

> Does it act to enhance the resource capability? Does it contribute to the transfer of knowledge to graduate and undergraduate programs? Does it enhance the image of the University in the community? Does it enhance the capacity to recruit staff and students? Are there any special benefits to the University as part owner? Are there any revenues associated with the project? Does it involve subsidization or utilization of university space? Is there any potential liability for the University? What are the long-term funding implications? Has a phase-out of university's involvement been contemplated? (It should be a quick in and out.)

Much concern was expressed about the levels of commitment of both the federal and provincial governments to funding university research: "Basic research to both governments is garbage." "It is easier to get private money." "The level of funding of government precludes much first-class research." This was considered particularly alarming since "It is not salary that brings good people here, but rather research grants."

Respondents worried about negative repercussions from competition for research grants: "We operate in a competitive model. Every professor is pitted against every other. This destroys a lot of creativity." One respondent described an initiative of the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary where they both agreed to share a list of research projects. "In areas where there was overlap, researchers are getting together and loving it." It was recognized, however, that there are many problems surrounding this type of arrangement, including ownership and control.

The biggest complaint from the academic staff members was what one respondent called "grant or go." "In the last 20 years, we have seen a growth in the expectation that individuals will seek funding." One respondent provided the

interviewers with a copy of a letter to the editor in Canadian Research (1987) which summarized many of the sentiments expressed:

> For example, there have been instances, known to everybody, in which tenure or full professorship was withheld, not because the candidate lacked a sterling record in research and teaching, but because that person did not bring in significant funds. To judge professors on the basis of the loot they bring in is as ludicrous as to judge the success of a pirate on the basis of his publications unless, of course, one is hiring a professor of piracy. . . . Universities now tend to evaluate professors by the level of input—grants, contracts, number of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows, individual consultancies. Much less attention is paid to the really important factor, output. The fundamental question here is this: should universities encourage professors who act as funnels for grants and research on "relevant" topics while producing little original work, or should they continue to be Meccas of truly creative research by highly talented people who may not be magnets for large funds? . . . This focus on grantsmanship can, at times, give rise to another evil, namely research by proxy (also called head of the laboratory or principal investigator). As the "grant owner," this person appropriates the work of the "serfs" and puts his name on without adding any detectable intellectual effort, ideas, interpretation or analysis. (Vijh, 1987, p. 4)

One by-product of this "grant or go" approach, particularly as an extension of "publish or perish," was seen to be that it contributed to exacerbating the perceived problem of the emphasis given to research over teaching within the University.

2. Research and teaching. Most of the responses in this area concerned the relationship between research and teaching and the degree to which they were seen to be codependent. There was a general consensus among respondents that teaching was somewhat dependent on research. Among the reasons given were that "the best researchers are often the best teachers; their curiosity and enthusiasm are infectious." Another respondent commented: "you have to know the literature if you do research: it forces you to do that; there is a direct spinoff on the currency of classroom material."

But many respondents qualified their statements. "To say that teaching can only be enhanced by research is an overstatement." It was recognized that some researchers are not very able teachers, but the consensus was that a positive correlation existed between the two, although a less robust one than was often put forward.

It was noted by several respondents that the emphasis within the University of Alberta was more on research than teaching and that, as academics increased their research profile, they tended to decrease their student contact hours. "In the classroom, the number of highly qualified staff shrinks where you have rapid promotion, and salary and rank tied together. As people get more expensive, you want them to teach graduate courses." Several suggestions were advanced to deal with this issue of balancing research and teaching. Two respondents advocated ongoing initiatives to counterbalance the natural tendency to emphasize research, given its key position in the reward structures of the University. Another advocated the use of "teachers who could just teach while staying current on the literature, for some pockets of courses." Another suggested a "need to rethink our definition of academics. Maybe we should not pigeonhole our people into one definition." Yet another saw the balance changing over the course of a career: "There could be a change in the balance [between research and teaching] in a person's career. I don't think you keep getting better and better at everything."

But the problem still remained that "unless both are seen as equally estimable, you have a class system." This led one student interviewee to question whether "the product of the University is trained or educated students, or is it research and to a lesser extent, teaching?"

Another corollary question was posed by one of the interviewees: "Can you be an outstanding research institution and still be an outstanding undergraduate institution?" Examples were cited which tended to support a negative answer.

"Stanford has tons more money but still has undergraduate classes with problems. I am not certain that an international university can be all things."

A second group of responses considered teaching quality and teaching formats. It was generally agreed that "we need to think creatively about how to be effective educators." It was also acknowledged that "our relationship with students is not always where students are seen as clients." The need to consider nonconventional approaches to teaching was also seen to be important. One respondent observed:

> We have not changed the format of teaching for over 35 years. . . . There is change occurring in the kind of teaching and learning that goes on in institutions. We are moving to a different relation between teacher and learner and what their contact is. . . . We should introduce demos on teaching at the University. These could have a ripple effect where the institution goes on learning by itself.

While both research and teaching were viewed as equally important, and while they were viewed as interrelated, there appeared to be a consensus that research was more valued within the University than was teaching.

3. Quality. One interviewee argued that the University had not been effective in promoting many aspects of its excellence: "We have one of the finest drama departments in the nation: we should be documenting directors of the theatres, playwrights, that have graduated from the U of A."

Several interviewees saw a decline in the quality of service to students despite a rise in the fees which they pay. Large classes, fewer tenured professors teaching at the undergraduate level, and outmoded teaching methods were cited by the respondents.

Respondents also wondered about the quality of the University-level education available through colleges. "Colleges are perceived by many as offering a lesser quality of education. Colleges and degree granting is an issue of quality. This could turn Alberta into a degree factory."

4. Community needs and service. The need to tighten the relationship between the University and the community was seen to be important. "We need to build bridges between universities and communities. There is currently a division between town and gown." Several suggestions were put forward. "Forums and feedback take time but they give people an opportunity to say something. We need to get this kind of process going." "Is the neighborhood the best way? Super Saturdays? Through friends and groups? Through alumni groups?" Other respondents questioned the wisdom of some of the recent cutbacks. "We need to be careful not to cut things the community is asking for, for example, the Department of Extension, where the community is demanding to know more of what is going on." "We shut down Varsity Guest Week which was a highlight of the city. We should be reaching out to the public."

One respondent saw a great deal of public disillusionment with the University's apparent inability to contribute to the resolution of social problems. Another condemned academics' unwillingness to contribute even qualified opinions on many social debates, lest they set themselves up as targets. It was however acknowledged that "many faculties have an active presence off campus."

What was unclear from the statements in this section was the definition of community. Some viewed community as the immediate geographic area surrounding the University, others as the city of Edmonton, others as the Alberta electorate, yet others as the communities that make up the larger Edmonton or Alberta community, etc. One would expect that different strategies would be developed to foster closer relations with each of these various communities or publics, yet this differentiation was not explicit in any of the respondents' statements.

Leadership

Responses in the general area of leadership were broken down into five subgroupings, namely President and executive committee; deans and chairs; Board and Senate; faculty; and non-academic and support.

President and executive committee. Respondents indicated that they looked to the President for vision and leadership. "The President is there to provide for vision, not to balance the bloody books." "The President is charged with the administration of the whole institution, the whole family." One important aspect of presidential leadership was seen to be the lobbying function, both externally and internally. "The University is not lobbying the government effectively." "Our approach with the government should be a dual approach—we are underfunded, yes, but we need to clean house." Some respondents saw the Board as an arm of government and they saw the President's role as "to instruct the Board." One respondent wondered who was really running the University, the Board or administration. The President was also seen to be an important figure in promoting the University with the public.

A certain amount of frustration was expressed with decision making in upper administration. "Senior administrators are more of a model of gathering advice than making decisions." Interviewees in the study expressed dissatisfaction with the levels of consultation with faculty on important decisions. "There is frustration with upper administration. . . . They appear as a small group without administrative input from deans, chairs, etc." It was also felt that senior administrators were "not part of the same collegiality" as the faculty.

Several respondents emphasized the importance for the President of understanding and cooperating with the various governance structures of the University, such as the Board, General Faculties Council, and deans and chairs. They likewise stressed the importance of external relations with various constituents.

Since the President was relatively new, few respondents expressed definitive opinions about his leadership. One faculty respondent was disappointed with the apologetic tone of the President's response to the 1991 Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education. "He wrote back a demoralizing letter with a narrow-minded approach to the University's function which showed a lack of understanding of true scholarship. . . . The University's message should have been positive rather than apologetic." Generally, people were either fairly positive ("The current President has a broader perspective than do people in the intermediate levels") or unsure ("Davenport is an enigma still").

Deans and chairs. The position of chair was presented as the pivotal position in the University, with deans also being perceived as important "especially in non-departmentalized faculties." One non-academic respondent stated bluntly that "Department heads and deans are the main problem with the University." It was strongly held that deans and chairs should provide more leadership: "Deans and chairs can make a big difference."

Several interviewees commented on the lack of knowledge and managerial skills of many incumbents at these levels. "Some academic stars are terrible administrators." "Deans and chairs need a good knowledge of how the system works formally." "There are no shortcuts; you do have to know the rules." "Many do not have the capabilities." "People-handling skills of many deans and chairs are poor." One respondent commented that "Chairs and deans are academics first and administrators second." Another felt that "The University has grown astronomically and the old boys did not adjust to the new reality. Several heads did not know how to govern a large department." It was however recognized by one respondent that in the past, negativity and obfuscation had often proven to be a useful strategy in avoiding change.

One interviewee commented on challenges to chairs. "Departments will increase in size. . . . They need to be better managed in terms of planning,

evaluation, the use of creative processes to get the job done, finding ways to maintain input and keep staff." Chairs were also perceived by several respondents as not exercising leadership. It was argued that chairs needed considerable skill in building a positive organizational culture within their departments.

Another perceived problem was deans' and chairs' perceived unwillingness or inability to think at the level of the University as a whole. Some saw this as a systemic problem, while others saw the problem as relating to incumbents themselves. Collegiality was also seen to be lacking among deans and between deans and chairs. "Midmanagers are not functioning as a collegial structure. There is token collegiality. When push comes to shove, it's just not there." Administrative positions were seen to be unattractive to many faculty members: "People stay out of administration because they do not feel that they can make a difference."

Leadership of deans and chairs was presented as a key issue for the University. "We don't have the best minds or the best managers in those administrative positions."

Board and Senate. The Senate was presented as largely ineffectual, although it was recognized that it had done some good work at the time of the interviews, primarily in the form of reviews. The Board was seen to be more involved and more militant than at any time in recent history: "The Board of Governors is much more active in trying to run the place." Most interviewees saw the Board as wanting to expand its control. "The Board is very control-oriented. They want to overrule GFC on policy they are not comfortable with." This was felt by many to be driven in part by the financial problems of the University.

Respondents for the faculty and the intermediate groups tended to see the Board as meddlesome and ill-informed. "They are well-meaning amateurs who seem to want to do more of the day-to-day business." Conversely, student interviewees were more positive. "The Board is great." They highlighted the

Board's work in enhancing the quality of teaching and in pushing responses to community needs. Some faculty and intermediate respondents saw the Board as an extension of the government. One respondent suggested that "If we had a representative Board, then the government would be less concerned with setting university priorities."

Board roles were seen to include fundraising, liaison with communities on their needs, and quality. It was noted that "the current [restructuring effort] started with the Board." As mentioned earlier, it was seen to be the President's role to ensure that the Board was "educated" appropriately.

Faculty. The most common qualifiers attributed to academics were "conservative" and "stubborn." Academics were seen as detached from reality: "Too many academics are not aware of the world around them." They were also seen to be more litigious, more isolated, and less willing to share. "Some senior professors are a one-man operation. . . . I'm not sure these resources are being used effectively." Academics in their 40s were seen as particularly vulnerable to stress and burnout. "That group has the heaviest teaching loads. . . . [They] feel considerable pressure to assume administrative roles." Academics were presented as unlikely to aspire to administrative positions. "Academics vigorously try to avoid administration and rightly so." Only one Other–External respondent described academics as "selfless" in pursuing their research interests.

While it was argued that "academics have a sense of what the University should be," it was hard to envisage them coming to any kind of a consensus, given the description presented of them. Their role in university leadership, other than for those involved in the University's academic staff association, was seen to be marginal at best. The breakdown in collegiality was presented as having serious repercussions on department and faculty decision making but also on the participation of faculty members in university governance mechanisms.

Non-academic and support. Non-academics and support staff were presented as second-class citizens who were not given equitable access to decision making in the organization. Non-academic interviewees felt that valuable perspectives were being lost. "Non-academics perform as an infrastructure—you can have a high performance car with a lot of options but if the water and fuel are down, it just won't work."

One dean was cited as a leader in involving non-academic and support staff at a more meaningful level. That faculty was seen to have benefitted significantly from this dean's initiative in involving them. Most other intermediate leaders were seen by academic staff to be arrogant, disrespectful of them, and largely uninterested in affording them greater participation.

External

Provincial Government Involvement

Three principal groupings emerged from the analysis of responses in this area, namely funding, sector planning, and direct intervention.

Funding. In 1991 there was broad consensus that government fiscal restraint was not a passing fad but that "it will be with us into the foreseeable future." It was seen that "many people don't want to or can't understand that, for example, the unions." While some of those interviewed believed the University to be "chronically underfunded," others took the view that it was "beginning to be underfunded." Most respondents felt that the funding shortfall had simply exacerbated problems that already existed but had not been adequately addressed.

The University of Alberta was presented as a public, post-secondary institution which had traditionally relied on government funding for roughly 80 percent of its operating costs. This prompted several calls for the government to assume its responsibilities. "In a state institution, it is the responsibility of the government to provide resources for basic programs and equipment."

All agreed on the need for more fundraising. "The government will fund to just above average quality. Endowments will permit excellence." There was also consensus that fundraising dollars should not be required for the ongoing operation of the University's basic programs and infrastructure. Student respondents worried that new funds would have to come either from the private sector or from students. "They can't force the private sector but they can force us." One respondent complimented the government on its past practice of matching endowment fundraising in universities.

Several interviewees expressed a profound distrust of government. "What upsets me even more is that this government will turn any success in fundraising back on us." Several respondents chastised the provincial government for not viewing its expenditures on education as an investment rather than as a cost.

Some of those interviewed offered insights into the workings of government funding. "The government has been unwilling to move from block to enrolment-driven funding." It was expressed that this was likely due to "the feeling by ministers and civil servants that they can cope with a set amount available when this type of arrangement is in place." It was also noted that "if funding is per student and enrolment goes up, you need capital as well." Block funding was described as "a balance between what was thought to be the cost in 1976 [when block funding was introduced] and the autonomy of the institution." "[Block funding] is not a good prescriptive tool—there is an element of trust." The normal view of block funding as a closed envelope system was presented by one of the respondents as largely inaccurate in the Alberta context:

> It may have suited universities in the 1980s to make it appear block funding was the only available funding. A major source came from five-year special funding. In Alberta, at the end of five years, the money would be added to the global budget. The arrangement was not purely block funding. There is a two-year horizon on new initiatives now. Those organizations in

the best posture at year-end were those who over time had taken advantage of these special discretionary funds.

Problems were also raised in relation to the government's budgeting practices. "In some years universities do not know their allocation before May, never before December." One respondent provided the government perspective: "Multiyear funding is problematic for the government. Unions use these numbers as a benchmark—80 percent of operating goes to salaries and wages in institutions."

The question of autonomy of institutions appeared as an important point. Respondents within the University argued that "Colleges and technical institutes must have their budgets approved by the Department of Advanced Education and Career Development. Universities have to table financial statements: ex post facto knowledge." Representatives of government for their part indicated that they "do not want to upset the autonomous nature of universities." Notwithstanding, there was a sense among respondents within the University that government was eroding institutional autonomy.

Another issue around funding was the perceived inequity in funding between the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary. "The Dupré [1987] Report [on funding of post-secondary institutions in Alberta] showed inequities and provided recommendations on how to balance them." One respondent noted that Calgary's student residences had been fully paid for by the government "while the U of A is saddled with monstrous interest costs on a 50-year mortgage." This was attributed to different political attitudes at the time of each of the developments.

The Minister of Advanced Education was presented as well-meaning but "lacking any power in Cabinet." His ability to further or even to protect the interests of universities in Alberta was seen to be minimal.

Sector planning. Sector planning emerged as a salient concern for many respondents. "There is not one post-secondary system in Alberta." "Who

coordinates all this?" "Current approaches are not addressing interuniversity problems." "Why are we sitting here without a regional plan?"

Several interviewees questioned the ability of the University to "plan strategically in the absence of a plan from Advanced Education." The necessity for a sector-wide plan was highlighted:

> There is an erosion of the compartmentalization of institutions within the group. NAIT, the colleges, and the universities are all involved in furthering knowledge. There is greater transferability of thinking and students. There is a challenge to universities seeing themselves as the prominent peak of the pyramid.

One interviewee described the post-secondary sector in Alberta, qualified by a second respondent as "overbuilt."

> There are 27 institutions, four universities, the Banff Centre, university colleges, including the Alberta College of Arts, two technical institutes, fi schools of nursing, and four vocational colleges. There are four consortia of post-secondary institutions operating in rural areas. We have some interprovincial agreements with other universities. A number of out-of-province institutions are also active in Alberta. Two of our universities are international stature multiversities.

The question of who coordinates the post-secondary sector and its myriad institutions appeared especially relevant in light of institutional autonomy and the government's expressed wish to respect that autonomy, at least as far as universities were concerned. There were two main types of responses to the question of "who should do the coordinating?" Some saw the need for the government to make decisions on system priorities but they were in the minority, partly because of the government's perceived poor track record in this area. In the past, with plentiful resources, it was reported that the system had been "driven by the political agenda with no overall coordination." Respondents confirmed that th first priority had been geographic access to various programs throughout the

province but that the logic of politics had very often overridden more conventional logic. It was also acknowledged that there were necessary trade-offs between system efficiency and such priorities as geographic access.

The feeling expressed by most respondents was that the province was looking to the sector for leadership and that the two large universities should be playing a key role. Many respondents saw an opportunity for the University of Alberta to assume leadership in this area, given its status in the province as the only true multiversity with international standing.

One respondent felt that sector planning could best be done cooperatively by the institutions in the post-secondary sector. He went on to describe a case where "peer decision making" had successfully been implemented and which he felt could serve as a model for broader decisions on sector planning.

> If Advanced Education showed more respect for the University community, we could sort out our differences. On the issue of library funding, universities worked out their own formula for the allocation of $9 million from the Heritage Fund and it worked. It also produced a greater commitment to sharing and interlibrary loans.

While this mode of decision making by stakeholders themselves was clearly favored, it was recognized that at present no system or process was in place to facilitate sector planning by the institutions in the sector.

Two respondents expressed some support for a renewed governance structure built around a provincial board of governors. Another advocated the creation of regional educational authorities to look after the interinstitutional, sector-wide issues in each region. These responses tended to come from Other–External or –Internal respondents. Rather, the majority of the respondents favored a forum of institutions with the province acting as a facilitator. "Government should be playing a lead role in conversation among sector institutions."

The basic challenges in the type of mechanism described above, i.e., a forum of institutions with provincial government facilitation, were seen to be the ability of the respondents to look beyond their immediate self-interest to sector-wide interests. "There is a great need for more discussion at the system level and a coordinating committee with Advanced Education." While some respondents were skeptical, largely because of the attitudinal change required for such a model to work, at least one respondent who supported this model felt that "The experience of making difficult decisions can be acquired."

Comments were numerous on the desirable level of provincial involvement. Interviewees worried that the government lacked "vision and foresight" and "expertise and information." "They would like to have a plan but they do not have the wherewithal." One respondent saw Advanced Education's role "in the Act as responsible for orchestrating funding: one-step-removed management" and went on to say that "It is not reasonable to ask universities to solve interinstitutional problems on their own." But most advocated greater involvement of institutions on a broader range of issues, including allocation of resources within the sector and to some extent even to the sector within government. Attaining that level of involvement was seen as an uphill battle, however, "since the relationship between the government and universities is not good."

Despite talk of amalgamating faculties and avoiding duplication, it was recognized that "some duplication makes sense." The point was however made that decisions should be made on the basis of what was best for the sector in terms of long-range priorities rather than exclusively on political grounds. Respondents supported a significant involvement of the government in sector-wide decision making, primarily in a facilitative role, with a concomitant expectation that the government would assume financial responsibility for sector decisions, including those which were blatantly political.

In summary, interviewees described an almost total lack of sector-wide visioning and planning, caused partly by institutions' reluctance to assume leadership, partly by the government's reluctance to play an active facilitative role. The government appeared, however, to be exercising considerable power through its control of the purse while at the same time refusing steadfastly to take a lead role in sector-wide rationalization, in the name of institutional autonomy.

Respondents also faulted the University of Alberta for not having taken a more active leadership role in advancing planning in this key area, since to a significant extent, one would expect the sector-wide vision to reverberate throughout institutional strategic planning.

Direct intervention. Despite a clear perception that government was not taking an appropriate role in sector rationalization, a majority of those interviewed faulted the provincial government for inappropriate involvement in sector and institutional governance. It was noted that government had ultimate control over universities "because they control the Act." Evidence of greater control was provided by several respondents, for example, in the provincial government's control of board appointments, in its control of tuition fees and its propensity to control priorities within universities through targeted funding, and in recent legislative changes: "The changed legislation gives the Minister of Advanced Education more say in cuts, expansion, etc."

Comments about the Minister and senior provincial officials clearly presented the view that the University community's relationship with the government was not very positive. One respondent summed up the feelings of many of those interviewed: "Beware of the bureaucrat in a drab suit and a government seal tie clip."

Other Players

Business. Some interviewees felt that the private sector was "badly in need of re-education." This need to re-educate was seen to be particularly important in garnering support for basic and applied research within the University. Part of respondents' aversion to and less exalted view of business appeared to stem from the Board and its perceived activities in the past months.

One interviewee felt that the private sector was giving mixed messages: "Graduates do not have enough skills, and give us people with generic skills and we will do the rest." Another disagreed: "They want flexible people who can see the possibilities. If [private sector representatives] do not become involved, they will not influence the nature of graduates." One respondent questioned whether the client was "the student or business or both." Another worried that "corporate funding tends to go where the best is or the best tax breaks." He felt that "The University will continue to decline, making it less attractive to corporations."

The respondents did not indicate any fear of loss of autonomy in interacting more closely with business. The biggest concern appeared to centre around the long-term fate of basic research. Much of the negativity in this area appeared to stem from the perception that the private sector was not educated enough to the ways and goals of the University.

Federal government. One interviewee summed up the perceived problem: "The federal government is no longer carrying [its] share of the funding responsibility." Respondents cited a reduction in transfer payments provided through Established Program Financing (EPF) arrangements "which caused many to wonder where federal funding was headed." It was recognized, however, that the review of federal funding through EPF was precipitated in large part by some provinces "not handing over some of the money received for post-secondary education."

It was also felt that federal cuts to EPF were exacerbated by cuts to the two main research-granting bodies. "The federal government does not see research as a priority." Criticisms of the federal government differed sharply from criticisms of the province in the scope of the issues identified. The federal government was not presented as having an important role in regional or sector-wide coordination. This did not appear surprising given the province's jurisdictional primacy in education.

Summary of Findings

Phase 1 responses comprised a litany of negativity in all areas both internal and external. The University of Alberta was presented as a largely disoriented institution in serious trouble, lacking support from government and the public, lacking direction and focus, ripped apart by internal strife, and crumbling under the weight of a stifling bureaucracy. The only cause for optimism lay in the deep commitment and dedication of the internal respondents, and in the growing realization that change was inevitable if the University was to survive.

Firstly, the University was seen as lacking a clear mission or direction. Rather, it was seen very much to be still trying to be "all things to all people." Strategic planning as it had been carried on up to that point was not seen to be of much use in decision making in a period of budgetary restraint. Planning (including human resources planning) and management were seen to be substandard within the University. Further, the absence of sector-wide planning was seen to be a major liability in terms of the University's own capacity to plan. The provincial government was presented as shirking its responsibilities while managing the University through budget allocations and key performance indicators, all the while pretending to respect institutional autonomy.

The Board of Governors was generally perceived as wanting to be more involved in the ongoing operation of the University, a function for which most

respondents felt that it was ill-equipped. Relations between the Board and the academic committees were seen to be very tense and deteriorating.

Several interviewees stated bluntly that the University was poorly managed. It was also clear from interviewees' comments that there was no strategic management approach in place within the University. This was felt to result in many structures and processes being ineffective in supporting organizational goals, themselves unclear. Several internal respondents (groups 1 to 5) expressed high levels of frustration with decision making processes within the University. Many cited a complex gridlock of diffused governance mechanisms which appeared to have seriously affected the University's capacity to make timely and appropriate decisions.

Although deans and chairs were seen to be a key link in the management chain, they were generally perceived to be a weak link, lacking either or both the will and skill to manage effectively. Their lack of corporate vision (especially among the "old boys") was cited as an impediment to change. Likewise, their management of rewards was seen to be discouraging initiative and undermining excellence. Deans and chairs were presented as unable to act as the corporate level, in a sense to put on their university-wide hats in making decisions. This had resulted in the creation of fiefdoms where department and faculty interests were defended at all costs.

Academics were likewise not described in very flattering terms. Some were said to be abusing academic privilege and caring little for students. They were also presented as disconnected from their communities and immured in their ivory towers. Many interviews resonated with the same call for greater academic responsibility that echoed throughout Emberley (1996).

Non-academics and support staff appeared as the poor cousins of the institution, not taken seriously by academics and intermediate leaders, not afforded opportunities to contribute as full members of the family. It was also perceived

that they had been victimized in the restructuring and that a higher standard of due process was being applied to academic restructuring than was the case for units predominantly made up of non-academic and support personnel.

While there was consensus that academics must play a central role in university governance through collegial decision making, that collegiality was seen to be eroding and the "decision paralysis" that had set in was seen as resulting in an undermining of faculty influence. It appeared in the interviews that various imperatives for change were conspiring to either force the academic community to make decisions or to wrench power away from it. These forces for change included funding cuts, government and public demands, student expectations, senior administration within the University, and the Board of Governors. The fiscal situation of the University appeared as the key factor driving change. Deans and chairs were presented as either supporting inertia and the status quo (largely seen as GFC's stance as well), or supporting change, innovation, enhanced accountability, sound management, etc. This struggle pitted the forces for change against the combined inertia of the "old boys," the inherently conservative character of academics, and the aversion to change built into the institution and its culture. In this sense, deans and chairs appeared as "persons in the middle" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988, p. 20) with an important say in the eventual outcome of the struggle. It was thus not surprising to find that deans and chairs were identified as key positions for the University. The fact that they were largely seen to be dominated by the "old boys" group was seen to tip the scales towards decision paralysis.

Some respondents raised the inability of post-secondary institutions to develop a sector plan as a direct encouragement to the government to step in unilaterally. Similarly, if academics or departments and faculties could not decide upon a plan, would not administration or the Board or both be justified in stepping in? That appeared to many to be exactly what happened with the February 1991

cuts. Most agreed that a combination of bottom-up input and top-down leadership was required to ensure that participative mechanisms were made to work. Also seen as critical was the ability of internal interviewees to wear a corporate hat when looking at decisions potentially impacting the whole university. This was seen as not precluding top-down decisions when paralysis set in, but only where the participative collegial processes had failed.

Leaders were thus presented as requiring a strong knowledge of the mechanisms and processes in place and a highly developed capacity to "force" the participative process to come to a head. One major impediment to this type of balanced collegial leadership model was seen to be the inability and/or unwillingness of persons within the institution (a) to seek broad input into decisions, including input from non-academic staff, support staff, and the public, and (b) to put on their corporate hats and consider the well-being of the institution as a whole. One highly successful dean was widely perceived to be the prototype of this form of leadership.

"Academic responsibility" was seen to be particularly critical for academics if they were to retain the major say in the strategic governance of the institution. But there were perceived to be many obstacles to a renewal of academic responsibility, which appeared as almost insurmountable, among which a new culture of competitiveness, a paucity of cooperation and sharing, an every-person-for-him-or-herself culture, and a lack of strong leadership.

While funding was seen as an important issue, it was not perceived to be the only or even the most important challenge facing the University of Alberta. It was generally perceived, however, that the February 1991 restructuring document had largely been driven by the fiscal situation within the University. It was presented as highly suspect both in terms of the appropriateness of the measures proposed and in terms of the process used to move it through the decision making structures of the University. Overall, the restructuring initiative was seen to have addressed

only the objective of reducing costs, while doing virtually nothing to advance leadership and decision making within the University, nor, it was argued, strategic planning and strategic management. Recognized positive outcomes of the process included a greater receptivity to change within the University and a broader recognition that fundamental change was inevitable.

Phase 2 of the study examined the views of many of the same respondents five years later regarding changes and outstanding or new issues within the University of Alberta.

CHAPTER 5

PHASE 2 DATA ANALYSIS: THE 1997 PERSPECTIVE

Characteristics of the Interviewees

Thirteen of the 15 interviewees for Phase 2 were carried forward from Phase 1. As mentioned earlier, the two others were added, in consultation with advisors—one because of the position he occupied, the other because of the breadth of his experience within the University in the intervening years. Of 17 persons approached, one refused outright to be interviewed and one was not available for an interview despite repeated attempts to schedule one with him.

The interview sample from Phase 2 was comprised of nine men and six women, distributed according to Table 5. The numbers of respondents in Phase 1 are included in parentheses for ease of reference. In addition to providing evidence of gender comprehensiveness, the table is meant to convey the level of representation from each of the groups of respondents for each phase of the study.

TABLE 5

Distribution of Interviewees—Phase 2

Group	Men	Women
Executive Leadership	3 (4)	0 (1)
Intermediate Leadership	2 (3)	1 (2)
Faculty	2 (4)	1 (0)
Non-Academic and Support	0 (1)	2 (2)
Other–Internal	2 (4)	1 (0)
Other–External	0 (3)	1 (1)
Total	9 (19)	6 (6)

Of the 13 respondents carried forward from Phase 1, four were classified in 1997 in different categories than in 1991.

Classification Instrument

To ensure continuity in the presentation of data, the classification instrument used for Phase 1 was carried over integrally to Phase 2. While the focus in Phase 1 had been almost exclusively on issues and problems in 1991, the 1997 data dealt with issues and problems as well as changes during the intervening period.

Classification of Responses

As in Phase 1, the responses were generally classified at the third level in the framework. Many of the responses were again assigned to more than one classification cell and they were considered in the analysis of each of those cells.

Detailed Findings

Respondents were much more positive and optimistic overall in 1997 than they had been in 1991-2. The greatest perceived areas of improvement included improved perceptions of the University by government, business, and students; streamlining of governance mechanisms; harmonious relations between the President, the Chancellor, and the Board of Governors; the enhanced abilities and commitment of deans and chairs to the institution as a whole; the renewal of faculty through an aggressive early retirement initiative; the clarity of focus of the University, particularly as a result of the strategic planning exercise in 1993-4; significant enhancements to the research capability of the University; and a renewed mandate for the Board.

However, there were perceived downsides in many of these areas and many questions relative to the intrinsic nature of the institution endured. The provincial

government was still seen to be directing the University through targeted funding and key performance indicators. Although there appeared to be a greater focus on teaching, reduced numbers of faculty, increased use of sessionals, and other factors conspired to undermine somewhat the perceived quality of teaching and learning on campus. Although the fiscal house was seen to be in order, the spectre of larger maintenance and equipment capital expenditures still loomed large.

By far the most controversial area was executive leadership. While opinions differed on the qualities and capabilities of successive presidents, there was a general realization that significant change had occurred, albeit, many felt, with an unnecessarily high level of disruption and upheaval. Detailed findings follow, as in the analysis of Phase 1 data.

Internal

Governance

The classification of governance responses contained three principal groupings, namely the nature of universities, general characteristics of the University of Alberta, and governance mechanisms.

The nature of universities. As in Phase 1, universities were presented as large and very complex organizations with complex mandates.

Respondents rejected a more utilitarian concept of the University focussed primarily on job readiness but they acknowledged that the University would have to emphasize its achievements in this area. "What is unfortunate is we've been falling all over each other to sell the University's utility. While I don't think of us as a training centre I think we are, to survive, going to be emphasizing that more and more." Two respondents cited the government's own statistics showing that universities had done better than even technical institutes in percentage of graduates working and average wage. They called on universities to change public perception of the economic impact of a university education. "There are many

universities in this country who resist any assertion that their role is to contribute to economic development and employment: they seem to feel that although it is a consequence of their work, there isn't a direct cause-and-effect relationship." The University of Alberta was presented as having made major strides in this respect, for example through its involvement in Edmonton's "Smart City" program.

One respondent commented that private companies looking at universities would like to see them cut units and change direction quickly, but he felt that this would not serve society well. He went on to comment that universities were inherently conservative, and he compared the University to a huge supertanker. "To stop it or to change direction takes a lot of people doing a lot of things and often lots of things by lots of people get negated by the bulk of the mass. It's a slow-changing thing." This respondent also commented that while this may be frustrating when you are trying to effect change, "we are very happy with it when we want to have that sober second thought, that careful second look at something."

Several respondents commented that universities' ability to transcend fads and temporary emphases had allowed them to remain true to their fundamental mission. "If one just changed direction each time, and threw all the resources at each fad or outside pressure, I think it would be a very poor spending of public and University money. . . . And we wouldn't do well by [our students]."

One of those interviewed questioned how post-secondary education had been allowed to slip as a major priority of the public. He saw this as a key concern which had a devastating impact in terms of financial and other support. "How did we let education slip away as society's number one priority?"

Another respondent felt that the golden age of the expanding university had passed and that universities would recede to their pre-1960s levels. "I am optimistic that the University is going to survive and I would like to see it thrive again, but I'm not sure that it will actually thrive."

General characteristics of the University of Alberta. Observations in this section were grouped under five headings during the analysis: status of the University, readiness for change, decision making, constituent relations, and vision and belonging.

1. Status of the University of Alberta. Most respondents in 1991-2 worried that the University was not fully aware of how it was perceived outside the University walls. One respondent argued that the University, over the intervening period, had become progressively more aware of how the outside community saw it. He commented that the University had given a much higher priority to community relations and public affairs. Another interviewee argued that it was important for the University to be honest about its weaknesses, and to be seen to be actively addressing them, in essence demystifying the University and giving it a more realistic face.

There was consensus that the fiscal crisis had driven home the point that the University no longer enjoyed the levels of support from the public that it had known in the past. "When the government imposed the significant cuts and the premier called for the five percent compensation reductions, the staff associations . . . were very quick to realize that they lack the political support to fight this."

On the other hand, the University was recognized for its many efforts at enhancing its status with many constituencies. "I think the University of Alberta has, in the last four years, generally become more outward-looking, more entrepreneurial. It has developed a greater recognition that the learner and the community are, in the language of today, their clients." One Other–External respondent remarked: "I think attitudes are better; they're not down there digging a moat and trying to protect themselves; they realize that they're part of a complex global environment and they've got to be sensitive to what's going on out there." This view of the University as disconnected from its environment had been very strong in 1991-2.

One respondent complained that the University was being unfairly lumped in with other universities in Alberta and that it should be more appropriately gauged against other large multiversities.

> On top of it all, don't compare us to Athabasca and the U of C. With all due respect, that's not who we should be compared with. The public should be saying, how do we compare with the University of Toronto, the University of British Columbia, those in the same league.

Most interviewees felt that the status of the University had risen throughout the period, in part through increased awareness of and attention to constituent relations and public affairs. As well, a strategic direction had been set and there were visible signs of planned change throughout the whole campus. There was also an evident push for excellence throughout the University.

2. Readiness for change. While change had initially been imposed from the top down by President Davenport, an approach which was roundly condemned by several respondents, there was almost unanimous agreement that the University was now operating according to the strategic management model whereby decisions were being driven by strategic objectives. Several interviewees stated emphatically that there could be no doubt that the mission of the University and its strategic plan were central in decision making. "That is very much a touchstone that, in all decisions, is front and centre at every level because there is a plan and that is the basis on which resources are being allocated." One dean warned that "If you want to head off in your own direction and it's not the same as in the strategic plan, you're likely not going to be resourced to do it; you're on your own." The same respondent had expressed frustration in 1991 with the absence of strategic planning and management within the University.

Another major change reported by several respondents was the change in attitude and a general strengthening at the levels of deans and chairs within the University. "We have a much stronger set of deans than we did five years ago. I

think that is because we are more thoughtful about what a good dean is." This strengthening at the dean level was seen to be especially important given their central role in the management of the University. "I feel and I will always feel that deans run the University; they have a tremendous amount of authority, the big deans, and I think that's still the case."

Another important factor in the University's readiness for change lay in the changing nature of the faculty. Faculty renewal was presented "as creating an incredible opportunity to take on new initiatives, to be innovative in the program offerings and curricula or discovery areas, to attract the brightest minds not only to the University, but to Alberta and Edmonton." This respondent felt that the dynamic renewal would lead to creative linkages with industry, government, and society as a whole.

Faculty renewal, it was pointed out, had also significantly increased the number of retirements and resignations. Several interviewees felt that some of these departures had allowed the University to move forward more rapidly. "Things are changing for the better in the last year and a half. I think there were a lot of people very resistant to doing anything but just keeping things the way they were." Governance mechanisms and management practices were also seen to have improved significantly, thus breaking down some of the institutionalized resistance to change.

The biggest factors in enhancing the University's readiness for change were clearly perceived to be changes at the dean and faculty levels, coupled with a central strategic plan as the basis on which decisions were being made within the University. The high level of acceptance of the legitimacy of the strategic plan by a vast majority of respondents also appeared to be a key factor.

3. Decision making. Whether he acted out of frustration, personal conviction, or for the sake of expediency, it was perceived that President Davenport had acted undemocratically in 1991 in declaring a series of vertical cuts

to faculties and administrative units. Whatever the reason, the approach was condemned as unacceptable for a university. It was however recognized that the "shock treatment" had produced some desirable results. "Although widely resented, I think one of the effects that the top-down changes had on the University was a significant contribution to the understanding that change was real and that it was legitimate to challenge the status quo."

One respondent argued that another positive by-product had been a decentralization of decision making over time. He further argued that the strategic plan had allowed this to happen in a coordinated manner and that it had actually strengthened the University as a whole in its ability to make decisions. "I think that processes have been streamlined, and because of that, it's allowed more of the decentralized decision making to faculties and departments that has been helpful, and the strategic plan has held it all together." When asked about decision making within the University, one department chair reported that she got answers from the dean right away, "and the dean has lots of ideas of his own in terms of things to be pursued so that there's a very active, not only efficient administration, but a creative administration in the faculty." She indicated a strong sense of hands-on management with everybody quite clearly focussed on the good of the University.

While decision making was seen to have improved dramatically over the period, there was still concern that deans and chairs were not being properly trained for their very significant management role. "They have no training, no experience in management, and I don't know that it's ever going to change. Faculty are experts. They think management is common sense. It is, but there is more to it than that." Another respondent acknowledged this shortcoming but he saw it as a necessary price to pay to ensure appropriate decisions. Several respondents perceived that overall the quality of deans and chairs had improved significantly over the intervening period, in terms of their abilities and of their connectedness to central University goals.

On the whole, the decision paralysis reported so strongly in Phase 1 was seen to have been overcome through a combination of better people, streamlined procedures, and a clear strategic focus.

4. Constituent relations. The themes raised in Phase 1, poor relations with government and a communications problem in "selling itself" to its various constituencies, were still perceived to exist although to a much lesser extent. One respondent critiqued the University's public relations efforts.

> Whose fault is it that we are undervalued by the public, possibly misunderstood. Do they know what we do? I don't think so. Does government? I don't think so. So whose fault is it? In large part I guess we have to look at ourselves. And I don't think we're doing as good a job as we could in that respect.

A majority of respondents singled out the work done by the Vice-President (Research) in promoting better relations with a variety of constituencies. "I think one of the people that's been extremely successful in dealing with the provincial government and really bringing the message out has been Martha Piper." Among her achievements, several respondents remarked on the "Research Makes Sense" and the "Smart Cities" campaigns. She was presented as very effective in establishing links with government, private industry, municipalities, and such institutions as the Alberta Research Council. "She made her point and made it very well, and we've certainly made our point with the city." The improvements in constituent relations were also confirmed by the Other–External interviewee in Phase 2.

> The University of Alberta is working better with the colleges. . . . I think it is more sensitive to their broader responsibilities. I see it defining its role in international education. The President certainly seems to have taken on a leadership role there. . . . Rod Fraser talks about making the U of A in and of the community and very much building some bridges with the community because the community can benefit and has benefitted from the U of A and vice versa.

Hence, the University was presented as being much more concerned with and more successful at constituent relations, whether with governments, business, the general population, or the international community. The current President was seen as having made this a major objective of his presidency.

5. Vision and belonging. One theme which was mentioned in 1991-2 and which surfaced even more strongly in 1997 was commitment of persons within the University to its continued development. This commitment appeared as a major strength in pulling the University through the difficult years it had recently experienced. The strategic plan developed in 1993-4 was also presented as instrumental in reshaping the commitment of various faculties to the University. "I think that the U of A has taken its strategic plan and is working the plan and everything that I've seen to date would suggest that is very much the process that we're in right now."

Governance mechanisms. Much of the conflict referred to in Phase 1 was seen to have dissipated in favor of a re-emergence of a collegially based governance model. Responses in this section were grouped under three headings: characteristics, roles, and relationships.

1. Characteristics. Interviewees reported a number of changes to the governance structure which were perceived to have improved the University's ability to make appropriate and timely decisions. One respondent reported that General Faculties Council had restructured the way it conducted its business: "They've tried to eliminate some GFC committees by putting them together . . . the Academic Development Committee and the Priorities and Planning Committee have been rolled into one." Another respondent described the purpose of those committees: "ADC was supposed to look at the academic implications of any kind of major decision. PPC was supposed to look more from a financial impact structure, where things would fit in." By combing the two committees, respondents reported that "you shortened the process by one month because you

always had that one month lag." Overall, the committee structure was seen to be operating much more efficiently than had been the case in the past.

2. Roles. One interviewee described the limitations on the President in the governance of the University, and the immense potential power of the Board. She began by presenting the University as comprising a combination of centralized and decentralized decision making. "Tenure, promotion, hiring, academic curriculum, academic integrity, and student decisions about promotion, are all housed and harbored in departments." She further argued that a president or vice-president, no matter how capable they were, could not determine who was hired at a university. According to her analysis, central administration controlled policy and the budget, along with significant input into the setting of agendas for General Faculties Council. She further saw the Board as having final authority over fiscal and academic matters. "In theory, all faculty appointments are approved by the Board. Now they've delegated it, but if you read the Universities Act, they have fiscal responsibility and they have academic responsibility."

While the Board had been perceived as trying to micromanage the University in 1991-2, it was now presented as an open, responsive forum for constructive debate. One respondent commented: "Nineteen ninety-one to 1993 was likely the worst period for Board interference in management of the University. We had a Board at the time that was thinking that its Chair should really be the chief operating officer." But the appointment of a new Chair and several "interesting and valuable retirements" had totally changed the Board's approach.

> The Board used to meet every month; they only meet every two months now. They meet for the same length of time so they can't possibly micromanage as much as they used to, and so they are tending to be more at the policy level.

The President's authority was presented as having increased during the Davenport regime, because of his largely internal focus and his "directive approach." The current President was perceived as having laid out general directions and having largely left the management of the University to the Vice-Presidents. The Vice-President (Academic) was seen to be powerful and several interviewees commented on how well he was doing in his role. The Chancellor of the University and the Senate were seen to be playing a very positive role within the University. Several respondents mentioned the Chancellor's political adeptness in particular as a great asset for the University. Student involvement in formal governance mechanisms continued to be seen to be very good. If anything, the University was presented as more student-focussed than in the past. Deans continued to be seen as central figures in the governance of the University, and, as mentioned earlier, they were generally perceived to be much more capable than had been the case in the past. Similarly, the competence of chairs was seen to have improved. The position of chair continued to be seen as a "thankless job," albeit a very important one. Administration was also presented as continuing to be largely unattractive to most academics. Non-academics were not perceived to the same extent to be uninvolved in decision making within the University. Two interviewees cited examples of non-academic staff members having played a central role in key decisions at the university-wide and department-specific levels. The respondent who had expressed the most vociferous concerns in this area in Phase 1 could however not be included in the Phase 2 sample, because he was unavailable.

3. Relationships. By 1997, the general perception of adversarial relationships within the University had been replaced by one of greater harmony, particularly between the President and the Board of Governors. This disagreement which some identified between President Davenport and the Board was seen by a number of those interviewed to have had long-term consequences. "The fracas

between the President and the Board is gone but not forgotten. . . . I think it was really unfortunate." One interviewee argued that poor relationships had been central in President Davenport's failure to obtain a second term as president. "My perception . . . was that he lost out because the Board thought he wasn't tough enough and the faculty thought he was too tough, so they both wanted to get rid of him for opposite reasons." However, most respondents felt that no permanent damage had been done, largely because faculty members "don't have much of a notion of what the Board of Governors does."

Collegiality, reported in Phase 1 as strained because of competition between faculty members, was seen to be strained anew by the faculty renewal program, more specifically, the practice whereby academic stars were being offered enhanced starting salaries, research funding, and/or equipment. One of the interviewees observed: "People are coming in now expecting to be paid outside of the normal scale. Where that happens is in the competitive areas." The same respondent presented a graphic example of the type of problem that this form of hiring might create.

> Let me demonstrate. Let's say you were hired five years ago, progressed well, did your share of teaching, research, administration. A new recruit comes in, all that kid has is potential but in a competitive area. The kid is hired at $50,000 more than you're making right now. . . . This kid has an office right next to you. He's making more, you've been through the hoops, and, by the way, would you mind mentoring him, show him how to write research grants, how to be an effective teacher. . . . Unless you're a bigger man than me, I think you'd probably have your nose out of joint.

Notwithstanding this aspect of faculty renewal, relationships within the University were presented as having improved dramatically at every level. Gone from the comments was much of the frustration about decision paralysis, uninspired leadership, and lack of direction. Collegiality was also presented as much more prevalent than in 1991.

Management

The classification of management responses contains three principal groupings, namely resources, strategic issues, and outputs. Each of these is further divided into subgroupings. Coding of responses was done at the level of the subgroupings.

Resources. The resources grouping included budgets and financial assets; physical assets; human resources; management practices; and accountability and openness.

1. Budgets and financial assets. When asked to identify major changes over the intervening years, several respondents mentioned financial cutbacks as the most significant change. "The really big things that have happened since we last talked were major budget cuts. We took a 20 percent hit. . . . We collectively at the University had to remove $50 million from the budget in three years." It was argued that this was an enormous cut on a budget of approximately $320 million. "You start at $320 or $330 million and go to $278 to $280 million in 3 years, so it was 7, 11, and 3 percent. One year we took an 11 percent cut." It was also confirmed by most respondents that the changes in the period since 1991 had largely been motivated by the University's fiscal situation.

One respondent described the constrained environment within which University administrators were forced to operate during the cuts. She indicated that University administrators' hands were tied in two key areas:

> We couldn't raise tuition beyond certain amounts so we couldn't make up those losses and we couldn't decrease the number of students we were taking in. All the variables that any business would be able to play with, we couldn't play with.

All the while, it was reported that administrators were being told to be businesslike, despite being unable to control variables normally controlled by

businesses. "We were being told by our Board and by government to be businesslike, be financially accountable and start operating like a business, be corporate."

Generally, respondents felt that the University had not been in a strong position to oppose the cuts. "I don't think there was much sympathy out there for our institutions and their faculty; hopefully, that's time past, but I think our institutions were seen as fat cats, our faculty was seen as privileged, protected, not part of the real world."

Faculty were seen to be pressured to do more with less. "People were really demoralized with the cuts, because of trying to find those extra dollars, getting down to the bare bones. How can we cope and do our jobs especially since the provincial mandate was not to have a reduction in service." Additional pressures were seen to result from decreased levels of staff compounded by early retirement programs and reduced compensation, exacerbated of late by the larger salaries being offered to new star recruits.

Despite being pressured, it was argued that academics remained steadfastly devoted to their teaching, which was presented as an important activity, even for the top researchers.

> I think most academics would give up everything; they are even willing to accept cuts until it really starts to affect their teaching, because I think the majority of us are here because we want to teach, and certainly want to do research, but teaching is pretty key to even top researchers.

Several comments were provided on the increased level of fundraising being undertaken by the University and its benefits both in terms of money raised in the short term and of constituent relations in the longer term. The Other–External respondent aptly captured most of those observations: "I think that's going to provide short-term benefit in terms of raising cash, but also longer-

term benefits in terms of building bridges to the business community for research and for the learning function."

It was clear from the interviews that fundraising was attracting much greater levels of attention than in the past. One respondent commented that "there is a great deal of energy and planning and focus on fundraising, and of course we're just starting the capital campaign, and that is always preceded by several years of just getting commitments." One interviewee worried that planning within the University was being "shaped a lot by that question of what projects will be interesting to people who will give us money." Several respondents worried that private sector funding of research would cause basic research and research in the humanities to suffer. Similarly to Phase 1, there was also concern that private money often came too narrowly focussed or too clearly earmarked.

Two interviewees described a major fundraising strategy aimed at alumni. One faculty member in particular reported high levels of success in this area. Also reportedly successful was an internal fundraising campaign aimed at various levels of staff within the University. Many respondents remarked on the importance of fundraising for the current President in raising funds for the University. "The University sees fundraising as one of its main objectives, from the point of view of central administration. I think that's why they hired Rod Fraser. They wanted a go-getter in the area."

Students were presented as benefitting from fundraising in that "the biggest amount of money, some $64 million, is going toward student bursaries and scholarships, directly benefitting the students."

The overall impact of this increased emphasis on fundraising was generally seen to be positive, and the University of Alberta was seen to be ahead of other Canadian universities in adjusting to new fiscal realities. "Fiscally, the University has its house in order. . . . So it's positioned extremely well to get on with actually increasing its revenues from government, whereas others are not." There was also

a sense that the University had weathered the storm. "The worst is over. I think part of it is that the province is in a better financial position. . . . The students have made up some slack, with the tuition rates. Alberta used to be a really low-priced place, now it's one of the highest." In its February 14, 1998, edition (p. 12), the Edmonton Journal reported an 8.9 percent tuition increase. It appeared as though the prophesy discussed frequently at the Academic Development Committee that students would have to pay a larger portion of the costs of their education had come to pass.

Overall, it was felt that although the cuts had been very painful, their net impact had been somewhat positive, largely because of the creativity that had been required in dealing with them. As a result, one respondent felt that the University enjoyed a strategic advantage relative to other institutions which had not yet dealt with "the new fiscal realities."

2. Physical assets. This area received much less attention than in Phase 1. Concerns relative to the cost of replacing outdated equipment were not raised in Phase 2. As in Phase 1, some concerns were expressed relative to the "unfunded capital requirement [of the University] which is huge and which is not being addressed." One respondent worried that technology expenses were rising rapidly without appropriate technical support for the classroom, which was resulting in the technology being underutilized. With respect to technology and central systems, one respondent echoed the concerns of many managers in many sectors of the economy: "We throw money at a new system and just when we think it's going to work, something better and newer comes along and we have to throw a bunch more money at it."

3. Personnel. A majority of respondents provided responses in this category. As in 1991, issues in the area of personnel resources constituted an important focus.

Despite mirroring the Phase 1 results in terms of the saliency of issues in this area, the main focus of concerns appeared to have shifted from job security issues to issues surrounding the faculty renewal program. Even so, there were some issues which carried forward throughout the period. For example, the time pressures on executive leaders were reported to be even worse. "We don't have time, didn't have much time for strategic thinking and still don't have much time for it." Deans and chairs were also reported to be feeling the pinch, a finding which was not in evidence in Phase 1. One chair blamed staff shortages for the increase in workload. "Those of us that are left to do administration work are finding it tough because there's so much work to do." She commented that this was "the biggest impact that the crunch has had and it comes to us a bit after the initial cutback in funding."

Reductions and early retirement incentives appeared, in the short term at least, to have led to a significant increase in faculty workloads across the University. "Our staff complement has gone down by 250 to 300 faculty in the last four, five years. . . . I just think that people have to do more with less. I think it's going to continue." They were also presented as having adversely affected academic course offerings either through reductions to the number of courses offered in a given year, or through offering some courses more infrequently.

Another carry-over issue related to the complexity and increased number of court cases in the area of personnel issues. "We are spending more and more money on legal costs. . . . People are becoming more litigious and it adds to the problem." One of the respondents in the executive leadership group offered a further explanation for this increase in legal costs, citing a lengthy legal battle with the Non-Academic Staff Association (NASA) over trust employees working under research grants. The same respondent also recalled a previous marathon court battle initiated by a former president.

Poor morale from job insecurity was not raised as an issue although one respondent felt that many academics in their mid-40s were beginning to question their career choice in the face of increasing workloads and increased competition for research funding.

Academics were still perceived not to be stellar administrators although there was a sense that significant improvements had been made in this area. Attracting qualified chairs was still seen to be a major challenge. One respondent discussed the positive aspects of placing academics in leadership positions, despit their initial lack of training and experience: "We'd rather suffer and tolerate, put up with the initial problems and learning curve for everybody because again we ar them, they are us, and we understand each other a lot better." Having said that, he acknowledged that most faculty members were ill-prepared for the positions of dean or chair, and he went on to describe some of the training opportunities available to incumbents. "There are various management courses around, some run off-campus, some on-campus, that certainly help and the one offered by the Chairs' Council is good, if they can do it right in the first year before they become a chair or early on." In addition, the respondent identified mentoring opportunities as important for new appointees. "There are a lot of seasoned hands around, people that can talk about the nitty-gritty of budgets, plus personnel handling."

A small minority of respondents commented on evaluation and reward systems in the University, a theme which received much more attention in Phase 1 A dean commented on his perceptions: "We still have some problems, in terms of personnel management in leadership positions. I don't think we do a lot of things all that well in terms of giving good feedback or recognizing good leadership." One respondent advocated a more comprehensive appraisal process, similar to the 360° evaluation model currently on the market. "We have the Board evaluating the President, the President evaluating the Vice-President and so on. But we don't have the information flow from the bottom up."

Overall, the bulk of comments in this section dealt with various facets of faculty renewal. One detractor commented that the initiative was nothing more than an early retirement incentive plan which did not make sense from a financial perspective. "I've talked to the actuary and these programs don't make sense economically. In most cases, the people will leave anyway." Others viewed faculty renewal in a more positive light. "We're hiring about 100 per year from a pool of incredible talent." While no one questioned the quality of recent hires or the availability of highly talented applicants, one respondent wondered whether the right criteria were being applied. More specifically, he worried that too much emphasis might be placed on research and not enough on candidates' human qualities, seen to be essential in collegial relations and for teaching. "The big fear with faculty renewal is we hire the right sort of people, that we don't hire people whose only interest is a research career and don't care about the students or the quality of their learning experience."

One respondent saw younger staff as an important asset for the University and an important contributor to institutional resiliency. "Part of the resiliency of the University is the faculty renewal process . . . and younger staff tend not to have the same history and issues as do older staff who have been here through some of the problems."

Several interviewees worried about various aspects of retention of new faculty. One faculty member remarked that "the University doesn't seem to be interested in interrupting somebody's plan to go someplace else," citing a case where a competent faculty member was lost to the University because administrators did not offer his spouse a sessional teaching assignment. Another worried that not enough was being done to keep U of A graduates and the University's and province's investment in them in Alberta. A third saw that limited access to senior leadership positions might cause good people to leave the University, since many of these positions were being staffed from outside the

campus. Two other respondents wondered how the University could afford to hire, and retain, young "superstars." One of the interviewed faculty members commented on that very point:

> You have to offer young researchers something additional and that usually means a good dollop of money to get their research started. One of the problems of the program that they have in place is that you've got to give them sustaining funding because a lot of research is long-term. If you don't give them sustaining money, they're going to stay here, make their reputation, and then go somewhere where they're paid better. That's the crunch right now.

Several respondents felt that the term itself of "faculty renewal" was insulting to existing faculty. A faculty member described his distaste relative to faculty renewal as it was being carried out at the University of Alberta. "When you think about it, that term is very insulting. . . . Faculty renewal was a false face, and it didn't help that Klein was bombarding us with that damned metaphor about renovating his house."

One final group of comments centred on the feeling that, as one generational bulge retired, another was being hired in its place. This was somewhat mitigated by other comments to the effect that "young" hires tended to be in their forties.

Despite this long litany of concerns, however, a pervasive optimism emanated from the interviews, a confidence in the future that clearly was not present in 1991.

4. Management practices. Interviewees in Phase 1 were very critical of management practices within the University, citing a combination of diffused and committee-bound governance, poor management support infrastructures, and a weak strategic definition of the institution. These shortcomings were seen to be largely responsible for the decision paralysis, poor accountability, and general lack

of focus of the University. By all accounts, there were significant changes during the intervening period.

Major improvements in the efficacy of the committee structures and in the strategic definition of the University were noted earlier. One comment summarized many of the observations on management practices: "So we're still being asked to do a lot more with a lot less, and I think that the University is starting to do it a lot more efficiently."

Two interviewees commented specifically on the finding in Phase 1 that University administrators were not good managers. One felt that although there had been an improvement at the dean and chair levels, the University still tended to hire the academic stars who may or may not have the human resources skills for management. The second felt that the price paid in the quality of management by hiring internally was largely offset by the inherent benefits of this practice. It was noted earlier that preparation of deans and chairs specifically appeared to have become more of an ongoing concern within the University.

There was still concern that the University was a process-bound organization. "I think the University is a process-bound place anyway, this one more so than most, I think. I don't think we've overcome that yet. . . . There is no question that we are very clumsy." Nonetheless, there was evidence of a general improvement in the functioning of the committee structures in place within the University, recognizing its particular nature as an "ideas place":

> The University is a talking place. This is a place where ideas, understandably, have high currency, where the discussion and debate in a thoughtful, objective way, in philosophical ways, is a part of the animal and so therefore, there are going to be more committees than in a typical garden-variety business. However, I think the whole efficiency of the thing has improved.

One dean described a new equilibrium in his faculty between department autonomy and faculty solidarity, which he felt had vastly improved management

decision making. "We've taken some steps that have made the budget process here much more centralized. For example, vacancies have accumulated to the dean's office, something that we traditionally haven't done in the past." He felt strongly that the past practice of leaving vacancies in departments had resulted in the uneven development of departments. "People retire during the high times, you get to fill the positions; they retire in the low times, the position is gone, so that in time everything gets out of any kind of scope."

Several respondents stated that planning and resource allocation processes within the University were much more credible than they had been in the past, tied as they appeared to be to the University's strategic direction. Two interviewees described changes in personnel policies that they felt had greatly improved the efficiency and effectiveness of the human resources area, one relating to the standardization of data collection for a number of personnel functions, the other relating to a policy on workplace harassment.

Where in Phase 1 interviewees had reported poor management, decision paralysis, and haphazard planning and resource allocation, they now reported good, albeit somewhat cumbersome decision making, clearly focussed planning and predictable and trustworthy resource allocation processes. Clearly, the University had experienced a major turnaround in this area.

5. Accountability and openness. While it was acknowledged that the University had been derelict in the area of accountability and openness, it was felt that the province's imposition of key performance indicators had been ill-conceived and more harmful than it had been helpful.

One senior leader commented extensively on the need for accountability measures, and he presented the increased emphasis on measurement as a broad public sector trend which universities could not hope to avoid. "There has been a striking change that is happening all across public sector boards, particularly large enterprises; there is more time being spent on issues of accountability, governance,

performance measurements." He went on to encourage the University to take a lead role in describing performance indicators which might resonate with the public. "We've got to try to develop appropriate indicators, we've got to find the things that resonate with the public as difficult as it is for us, given the complexities and ambiguities of it."

Another interviewee stressed the importance of openness and accountability in consolidating the University's relationship with its various constituents. She argued that the University's inability to garner public support had caused it to lag behind health and education as government priorities, a theme also raised by a faculty respondent. "We could no longer only address our interests internally, we were entering an era where we had external constituencies that we needed to understand and be part of, and be integrated in." She stressed that this was a change in thinking for universities. "We weren't well suited to do it." The same interviewee was very critical of past approaches with funders and the public: "Saying we needed more money, thank you very much, and you're treating us terribly and you mustn't do that, just wasn't going to work any longer." She aptly summarized the challenge facing the University: "If we were going to prevail, we had to figure out a way to make the case, interpret our needs, our role, become integrated with the context within which we had found ourselves."

It was clear from several interviews that the message of accountability and openness had been clearly understood. Several respondents reported on efforts to enhance ties with various constituents. "Reaching out to the community has accelerated thirteenfold. The ivory tower, these bricks and mortar are now used to build bridges out to Edmonton and Calgary and the community and the private sector."

But the largest number of comments centred around the province's key performance indicators (KPIs). Andrews, Holdaway, and Mowat (1997) described them: "These KPIs focus on program/student outcomes, financial productivity,

and research and knowledge development indicators" (p. 85). The Other–External respondent commented positively on the University of Alberta's involvement in developing the KPIs. "The U of A's approach has been very constructive, they've worked actively on all of our committees to identify which KPIs were important, to put technical people on committees to help ensure that definitions were comparable." The respondent continued that KPIs were simply tools which could hopefully stimulate public debate around post-secondary education. "KPIs are tools, they don't remove the need for judgement. The University of Calgary has started a debate about more universal education. I see the KPIs as helping us in that debate, helping us understand what that means."

Performance measures were also presented as providing useful information to prospective students. "If you're going to buy a car, you ask for a consumer report. For the student in grade 11, the best thing is to have four entities like Maclean's magazine all measuring and you can take your choice."

Although most interviewees agreed that accountability measures were necessary and potentially useful, the majority of respondents felt that KPIs were too narrowly focussed on job readiness, and that the University itself should decide what needed to be measured and communicated.

Overall, the general feelings on the subject were probably best summarized by a respondent in the intermediate leadership group. He conceded that the province was probably right to feel that it deserved some accounting for its support. He also acknowledged that the notion of performance indicators had come as a great shock to academics, but that academics were aware that accounting for performance had become more widely accepted. He concluded, however, that there was "a way to go in the province and post-secondary systems each being a little clearer about what the other is all about."

If the province's objective was to heighten the awareness and the need for accountability measures, if it was to move the University forward in this area, then

the strategy appeared to have worked extremely well. This concern of respondents for accountability and their willingness to view it in a somewhat positive light represented a major shift from 1991, as did respondents' recognition that openness was essential to their continued existence. Likewise, respondents did not appear to be concerned to the same extent about government micromanagement of the University. With the increasing acceptance of accountability measures and their increased involvement with them, respondents appeared more confident that they could keep government intervention to a more manageable level.

Strategic issues. The strategic issues grouping was comprised of five subgroupings: strategic planning, focus on education, student needs, accessibility, and tenure.

1. Strategic planning. The perceptions that pervaded the Phase 1 data, that the University was unfocussed and trying to be all things to all people, were replaced by perceptions of a much sharper focus; a tighter causal link between directions, actions, and resources; and a greater conviction that changes were being made for the right reasons. One senior leader responded at length to the charge that the University was unfocussed, tracing the evolution of strategic planning in the institution and defending President Fraser's current approach. He began by describing the situation prior to 1991: "The history of strategic planning at the U of A was one of saying, this is our strategic plan, these are the 50 things that we want to do. Of course there's nothing in there that implied choice." President Davenport was presented as having developed a useful strategic plan that could be used in management decision making and resource allocation: "Certainly Paul [President Davenport] had a strategic planning process that developed a good statement of direction and some good guiding principles, and in fact, it had a remarkable shelf life."

When President Fraser was appointed, he was seen by many respondents as eschewing the University's strategic plan in favor of his own approach. One

respondent saw his approach as "largely consistent with Degrees of Freedom," but this was not the case for all respondents. Those key tenets of President Fraser's approach were presented by a senior leader: "When you talk about internationalization, when you talk about student recruitment in terms of getting better students here, when you talk about faculty renewal, all of those are initiatives that are good for the institution."

While those interviewed in 1997 had a clear understanding of the current President's priority directions, it was not always clear how these directions would be translated into organizational decisions, nor, in some cases like "internationalization," what they meant. Nor was it clear that the President would be moving rapidly to meld his directions with those of Degrees of Freedom, into a revised strategic document. His failure to recognize that the plan in place was a University document and not solely a document of his predecessor appeared to have cost him in terms of initial perceptions of him within the University. "I remember my first meeting with Rod Fraser, and I remember saying to him, what do you think of Degrees of Freedom? I don't think he even read it."

That did not detract, however, from the generally high level of confidence in the plan, and on its impact on decisions and resource allocation within the University. A typical comment is presented: "I think the strategic plan is a very good one and certainly gives a lot of direction." This was clearly strengthened by the fact that the Vice-President (Academic) had recently undertaken a review of the plan in light of President Fraser's priority directions, and that he was perceived as a very credible individual.

While there appeared to be a much higher level of satisfaction with strategic planning within the University than had been the case in 1991, several interviewees expressed frustration with what they perceived as deficient planning and resultant poor decisions in the past. One respondent remembered feeling frustrated in the early 1990s. "There was no notification that we had any

difficulties. It was like a huge kick in the pants. It was out of the blue and we had no preparation."

Several interviewees discussed the appropriateness of the restructuring decisions made since 1991. Their comments have been included in this section in keeping with the view that restructuring should flow from the strategic planning processes of the institution. "Looking more broadly at the U of A . . . I think some of the very difficult processes around our Faculty of Dentistry were important to address." Another respondent commented on another proposed merger: "The other process that was potentially there was a merger to a Health Sciences Faculty of four or five existent faculties. That did not happen." Instead, she reported that a coordinating council of health sciences had been created, which has proven to be a very positive structural change in that it retained the autonomy of different faculties which often have to be separate because of accreditation and other issues, but allowed for the commonalities to emerge and new initiatives to be undertaken.

Other respondents felt that some of the mergers were particularly ill-advised. "Some of the mergers were very bizarre; Forestry and Home Economics was one that I thought was a little more strange."

On the whole, most respondents were somewhat ambivalent about the overall impact of the restructuring. Some felt that it had been positive: "I think it worked quite well on the whole. I think most people would say it added a new adaptability dimension." Others did not share that view. They viewed restructuring as a difficult and harmful process which, in the end, had not generated significant financial returns. One interviewee commented that she had changed her views on restructuring. "I've really come full circle on that one and I think we spent a lot of time as an institution restructuring, but you know, I'm not convinced that it was anything but filling in the margins." She felt that "When you look at it come out at the end, that's not where you save money." As is often the case, most respondents felt that the truth was somewhere in the middle, that a new

acceptance of change had been created, new possibilities were being explored and developed, but that also much damage had been done to many people, many of whom left in the faculty renewal program, at significant loss to the University.

Several interviewees spoke of future challenges facing the University. One person in the Other–External group raised the possibility of joint degrees involving the University, community college, and technical institutes. Another interviewee advocated a continuing strategic assessment of problems and opportunities, and flexibility and imagination in addressing emerging needs. It appeared from interview comments that a very high level of strategic questioning, an important precursor to strategic planning, was occurring, and that there was a new attitude of confidence that identified issues would be addressed.

Strategic planning was an important area of response both in Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the study. It was clear that the existence of a credible strategic plan allowed changes to be made in a much less disruptive and demoralizing manner. Also clear was an expectation that the issues and opportunities identified through the strategic planning processes would be acted upon. The acceptance of change within the University had also increased dramatically. In this respect the University had progressed significantly.

2. Focus of education. As in Phase 1, respondents voiced support for a liberal education, not narrowly focussed on the acquisition of employability skills. "Publically, I don't hear much talk about the intrinsic value of the educated life, the examined life, all the things that we think are true." The University was generally recognized as offering a more comprehensive, more rounded education than was available from other institutions. In this sense, not much had changed during the intervening years, although there was more openness to capstone programs (where colleges offer the first year of a degree program).

Interviewees expressed concern that technology be properly integrated into teaching, and that appropriate resources be made available to faculty to "learn the technology."

3. Student needs. It would appear that the calls in Phase 1 for a greater focus on students within the University had been heard. Student interviewees reported that they were being treated "more as customers of the service." One respondent felt that "More emphasis is being placed on excellence in the classroom as opposed to excellence in the lab."

There was also agreement that more emphasis had been placed on attracting better students, and that the University was offering more financial support than it had in the past. "They're allowing economic incentives to come to the U of A, and that means heightening the quality and the profile of scholarships at the University relative to others. That also means increasing support bursaries."

Despite the increase in the number of scholarships and support bursaries, respondents worried that the pressure on students to succeed appeared to be mounting. "The students are very anxious, much more focussed on immediate concrete rewards out of a course. . . . I see a lot more requests for deferred exams for medical or stress reasons, much more concern over grades."

Interviewees appeared to be very attuned to improving the quality of teaching within the University. One professor questioned traditional teaching approaches aimed at imparting knowledge. "We pack huge quantities of knowledge into our courses, and I'm becoming more of a believer that it's understanding that we should be striving for."

Advising of graduate students was still seen to be rather spotty. "Clearly the student exit surveys confirm the fact that the quality of student advising is quite uneven, and there are parts of campus where it is unacceptable."

It remained, though, that overall, the University was seen to be more responsive to student needs than had been the case in the past, and more concerned than ever with the quality of teaching.

4. Accessibility. One respondent suggested that the University reassess questions of access in light of expanding distance education opportunities. He advocated the need for a balance between on-campus and distance education offerings, citing the numerous advantages of the traditional campus experience: "The partnerships, the alliances, the contacts, the spouses, the partners that they find while they are on campus turn out to be a central part of the importance of the degree that they acquire." He also acknowledged, along with other interviewees, that more was being done through distance education, and that more would be done in the future.

The University of Alberta was seen as having to overcome a bad reputation in rural Alberta: "They developed a bad reputation in rural Alberta as being arrogant, not willing to go off-campus." Comments were generally consistent with the lack of institutional openness reported in Phase 1.

Two respondents expressed concern that tuition fees were becoming a barrier to admission, a theme raised in Phase 1. Conversely, questions of universal access and enrolment management faded from the limelight they had enjoyed in Phase 1.

5. Tenure. Like the Board Chair who had championed the assault on tenure, this issue appeared to have disappeared into the background. The former Board Chair, who appeared to be the principal mover behind the attack on tenure, was seen to have been "misguided" and to have misunderstood his role. Nonetheless, tenure appeared as a constant source of potential misunderstanding with external constituents who tended to view it as unfettered job security. Tenure also appeared as an important hurdle in successfully explaining the University to outside constituencies.

Outputs. The outputs grouping contained four subgroupings: research, research and teaching, quality, and community needs and services.

1. Research. In Phase 1, issues in this area of research had focussed primarily on basic research, funding levels, problems with private funding, and the importance of grants. All these themes were still alive and well in 1997 in addition to concerns about the University's approach of funding so-called superstars.

One respondent worried that the increase in private support would lead to a reduction in basic research, seen as a key component of any research program. Another echoed many of the comments in Phase 1 to the effect that basic research was undervalued. It was clear from his comments and others that, like tenure, basic research was widely misunderstood outside the University. "We need to continue to make it clear to our various publics that the basic research that underlies that applied research is important too."

A third interviewee cautioned that different approaches would have to be developed to explain basic research. "The big area is going to be in the fact that everyone scrambles to explain their research on utilitarian social grounds, and frankly, there's a lot of research that goes on here where you couldn't make a connection." It was also acknowledged that some disciplines were easier to "sell" than others.

There was no doubt in anyone's mind however, that the former Vice-President (Research) had been very successful in developing research within the University, particularly in raising the profile of the University in this area, and in attracting funding. "Pound for pound, or on a per student, per capita basis, the U of A is getting huge research dollar amounts, equal to McGill and U of T. We are right up there in the front ranks."

The approach to funding centres of excellence and superstars was again seen by the faculty respondents to be fraught with perils. More specifically, some of those interviewed worried that the nature of research could be affected, with

more utilitarian research coming to the fore. It was also felt that morale could be weakened where superstars would be given more time for research at the expense of their colleagues. "Those people are freed up by virtue of the fact that other people are doing administration and teaching, and so this vicious cycle starts and the superstars advance at the cost of others." It was felt by that respondent that this vicious cycle would encourage more individualism and entrepreneurism, both of which were identified in Phase 1 as barriers to collegiality.

Private money was also seen to present issues. It was argued that the likely focus on more utilitarian research would freeze out certain faculties. Also, it was noted that private funders did not generally support infrastructure development. "There are many things wrong with more private funding. There are good things obviously. . . . The bad thing is that they're not very interested in infrastructure of course." One respondent referred to privately funded research as "gizmo research, where a process or gadget will come out the other end that can be transferred to the market."

The familiar refrain of "grant or go" echoed again in Phase 2. "I used to put it this way: what used to be 'publish or perish' is now 'grant or go,' and I think that's real now, definitely so."

While there were some themes which were consistent with Phase 1, it was generally acknowledged that the University had been very successful in raising its research profile and in attracting major research funding over the past five years. It was also recognized that much work had been done in promoting the value of research with various constituents in the community. But the approach to hiring superstars was seen by many to be a serious threat to morale within the University. Also, basic research remained misunderstood and difficult to explain outside the University.

2. Research and teaching. As mentioned earlier in the subsection entitled "Student needs," there was a sense that teaching had been emphasized more of late. "I have the sense . . . that the learning part of the mandate, and the teaching responsibility of the faculty are getting more attention now." This was eloquently supported by an Other–Internal respondent. "From my personal experience, I've had nothing but good experiences from my professors. . . . It's getting better because more attention is being paid to it."

While it was still advocated that research and teaching were inseparable and codependent, one respondent admitted that "We still have good people in this department who are both prolific researchers and excellent teachers and that is quite a rare breed." One respondent restated a position put forward in Phase 1, to the effect that professors experience different career cycles. "They have times when research is major and times when teaching is. Sometimes they have dry periods, sometimes they are both going great guns. I think the University's just beginning to recognize the variable career patterns in people."

3. Quality. While some respondents complained that the University had not done enough to highlight its achievements, there was evidence throughout the interviews of sustained efforts in such areas as research and internationalization. Overall, the quality of faculty and students was presented as having improved. Quality was presented as a major priority of the current president. "Very clearly our vision is not to be a regional University, but to be in the top two or three in Canada of those full service public universities and indeed in North America in terms of public universities." Nonetheless, some respondents felt that the faculty renewal program had resulted in a brain drain, and that many excellent professors had left the University.

4. Community needs and service. The great chasm felt in Phase 1 between "town and gown" was seen to have been bridged at least to some extent. One

interviewee provided examples of outreach activities. "And I'm involved with the downtown lecture series for the past two years. . . . And we take a Super Saturday downtown. . . . We had free space from Edmonton Centre. . . . CBC did interviews. . . ." As well, the University appeared to be much more attuned to the needs of rural students and more interested in developing initiatives around their needs. "We have heard the calls for regional access to our programs in places like Grande Prairie or Fort McMurray. Part of the answer is distance education and we have been doing more of that."

But one respondent felt that not enough was being done in this area, and he lay part of the blame at the feet of the new President. "This administration, the President's office, saw internationalization as an important mandate, so he's spending 50 percent of his time on internationalization; 50 percent of his time he's not here."

Comments in this section again echoed comments in earlier sections to the effect that while the University had been successful in enlisting some support from its various constituents, much work remained. Constituent relations were presented as an ongoing concern requiring unflagging and significant action.

Leadership

Responses in the area of leadership were grouped into five categories, namely President and executive committee; deans and chairs; Board and Senate; faculty; and non-academic and support. Responses were analysed at these levels.

President and executive committee. The period covered by this study was one of significant change at the levels of the presidency and the executive committee. In 1991 there had been cries for vision, more lobbying, and better relations with the Board. It appeared from the interviews that all of these topics had been addressed quite extensively during the intervening period. At the time of

the interviews, it was still not clear, however, how President Fraser's themes of internationalization and excellence would be wound into the University's strategic plan. One highly skeptical voice commented on the current President's leadership. "I think leadership is bringing people along whether it's demonstrated in decision making, or governance, or outcomes, or whatever. I just haven't seen it yet."

Another of those interviewed had a very different perspective. Dr. Fraser was credited with having a very clear vision. "There is no doubt in my mind Dr. Fraser was pressured to get some sort of vision in place, especially in the wake of the dramatic changes a couple of years back. He provided a very bold vision." However, on the whole, the negative comments outweighed the positive. In particular, it appeared that President Fraser's failure to relate his vision to Degrees of Freedom and to integrate it more quickly into the strategic plan in place was not a judicious move.

The importance of the President's role in lobbying for the institution was again highlighted as a pressing need which had not received sufficient attention since 1991. One faculty member saw it as having undermined the University's ability to pressure the provincial government to reinvest in post-secondary education. "We need to tell the public, 'Your system cannot afford these kinds of cuts, your child is coming to this institution,' and I don't see that. This is what you pay your leaders to do." Others felt that the University would not have been able to garner much support during the 1991 to 1994 period when its budgets were severely cut back. It was stressed that gaining public favor was a long and sustained process which had been long neglected.

Most interviewees felt that leadership was critical within the University, but several saw it coming from different sources in different areas. For example, no one appeared uncomfortable that the Vice-President (Academic) was responsible for renewing the University's strategic plan or, that for all intents and purposes, the

Vice-Presidents were running the institution on a day-to-day basis, given the President's frequent absences. Another commented: "The President is not making as many microdecisions, which is proper in terms of a half-billion dollar institution, and therefore the Vice-Presidents, we are lucky to have very good ones, have a great deal of freedom within the broad general policy."

Several interviewees commented very positively on the former Vice-President (Research). One respondent felt that it was a very flattering sign that Vice-Presidents were being head-hunted by prestigious institutions.

It was felt by some interviewees that the balance in recruiting to the executive leadership level, from external and internal candidates, needed to be re-established. "One of the things happening in administration is every time there is a high-up job, they go outside. Their theory is new ideas, not history, not loyalty. There's got to be a happy medium."

Several comments were made directly on each of the Presidents and on issues surrounding them. Myer Horowitz was certainly presented as the academics' choice. "Davenport and Fraser are economist types, quite a contrast to Myer Horowitz who was an academic first, thought about teaching a lot, research a lot. . . . Nobody's taught since Myer." One respondent was both kind and unkind. "Myer did a great job, he was a great guy. . . . He had an acute sense of fairness. He was very astute politically, but he liked to make quick decisions rather than good decisions." Notwithstanding this, and a couple of other negative comments, it was clear that President Horowitz had succeeded in attracting respect and loyalty both to himself and to the University, from a vast majority of members of faculty. This would prove to be a definite asset for the University in the years ahead.

If the jury was out on Paul Davenport in 1991-2, it certainly was not in 1997. The approach he had chosen in 1991 was broadly viewed as heavy-handed and arbitrary. More specifically, he was perceived to be insensitive to many

situations within the University. His image was that of a somewhat ruthless technocrat doggedly pursuing his goals, in the words of one interviewee, "come hell or high water." He was further perceived to have had preconceived notions about the quality of certain faculties. "Follow Dr. Davenport to Western. He wasn't at Western for three weeks when he announced he was going to cut the Faculty of Education and the Faculty of Dentistry. This all sounds pretty familiar."

One participant reported having heard a rumour to the effect that it was, ironically, a failure to get tough with the Chair of the Board of Governors that had cost him a second term as President. The rumour was built around two alleged incidents. The first instance revolved around better ties with staff and student associations. It was reported that President Davenport had agreed to joint meetings with the four associations representing faculty, non-academic and support staff, students, and graduate students. The Board Chair was said to have intervened forcefully in quashing this initiative. The second centred on the appointment of a lawyer on a particular personnel case. "The Board Chair apparently didn't like one of the lawyers working for us, so he went over the President's head to the law firm and ordered the guy off the case."

The President's disagreement with the Board was discussed by another respondent who saw the failure to reappoint President Davenport as having had serious repercussions for the University. "I think it was enormous stress and an enormous test of the resilience of the place, and I think we are still experiencing it."

One respondent also judged President Davenport harshly on his ability to select good executive committee members. "I was not impressed with the people he surrounded himself with, and at that point I have to say that it was a shortcoming of the President."

Another respondent felt that President Davenport's approach had nonetheless been positive for the University. "Paul believed one of the roles of the

senior executive was to make those tough calls. One of the by-products of that was a real eye-opener. . . . They might have thought it was clumsily done but it was overdue." Although most respondents agreed that the University evolved very positively during President Davenport's term, most notably with the development of the strategic plan, he was not fondly remembered. His regime appeared as a rather dark period of turmoil and unilateral action which had caused much suffering, too much of it perceived to have been unnecessary.

After his departure, the Vice-President (Academic) took the reins for a brief period. Although this was a short hiatus in leadership, it was felt by one respondent to have been costly for the University.

> After Paul [President Davenport] left, the U of A lost its direction there at a very crucial time. When I look at things like enrollment and access fund, there was a period where the U of A lost some opportunities because they really didn't have any leadership.

Rod Fraser, classified by one of those interviewed as "another economist," failed to impress some people initially by not familiarizing himself with Degrees of Freedom. He was, however, widely perceived as having a clear, simple bipolar vision centred on internationalization and excellence. His Vice-Presidents were perceived to be well-qualified to run the University, a task which had fallen largely to them as a result of the President's external focus and his frequent absences. He was also credited with having introduced the fairly well-received faculty renewal plan, albeit not in a very sensitive manner. As in the case of his predecessor, he was faulted for his lack of sensitivity to personnel matters within the University. "I think if there's one area he has a downfall, it's his human relations skills. I don't think he fully understands how important that is in terms of morale."

His hands-off style of leadership was however seen to allow the empowerment of key people within the University. "I think Rod Fraser's sense of

the way the University should be led is that the role of the executive is to establish a sense of direction for the institution, but then challenge the institution to respond to that." There was no doubt that the credibility of the Vice-President (Academic) was serving President Fraser very well in that regard.

An expectation was also expressed that President Fraser would be very successful in fundraising. So far, so good, concluded most respondents, although several were unsure that internationalization was worthy of 50 percent of the President's time.

Deans and chairs. The perceived lack of "will and skill" so prevalent in Phase 1 was replaced by a general feeling of much higher levels of satisfaction relative to deans and chairs. Also absent was the call for them to assume more leadership. One respondent commented: "I think there is a massive change and improvement going on right now." It appeared that the "old boys' club" had been replaced by a new type of dean and chair, much more committed to the University as a whole, and much more willing to cooperate. "I think some of the faculties are starting to work together. Also, I think chairs make sacrifices from a departmental point of view for the good of the faculty and overlook narrow departmental interests."

One thing that did carry over strongly was the perception that the position of chair was most unattractive. "It really is a problem. If I were a full professor, I would ask myself why in the world I would want to be department chair. It in effect stops the progress in your own discipline." Fortunately, though, it was seen that there were some people who did it as a matter of duty and honor. Another respondent commented on the reduction in incentives for deans and chairs, and more specifically the elimination of administrative leaves. "We haven't changed our administration honoraria since 1989 and we eliminated administrative leave.

This leave was available after five years at full salary instead of 80 percent normally available during a sabbatical."

Deans were clearly perceived to be key figures, in that the renewal at the dean and chair levels was seen as having contributed greatly to the success of the revival of the University. In Phase 2, the position of dean was presented as the more critical of the two, whereas in Phase 1, the emphasis had been more on chairs, although both were viewed in both phases as very important positions. This shift corresponded to a perceived shift in emphasis from primarily local, departmental concerns to broader, faculty-wide, and University-wide foci. Respondents felt that the strategic plan had been instrumental in this change.

Board and Senate. What emerged from the interviews, in regards to the Board of Governors, was a Jekyll-and-Hyde story. The previous Board was presented as arrogant, meddlesome, and ill-informed. "That whole Board saw themselves as police, and had this mentality that there were lots of people who were milking the system and needed to be brought to their knees." Further, the former Board was presented as having consciously distanced itself from faculty and non-academic staff. "When I was with NASA, we made a pitch to talk to the Board about the problems we were having with budgets, and you'd have sworn to God we'd asked to see the Queen or the Pope."

Conversely, the new Board appeared as a total turnaround from its predecessor. "With John Ferguson coming in as Board Chair, the tone changed. That tone is much more collegial, there's a lot more sympathy for the whole picture, there's a lot more desire to understand what's going on." One interviewee described a series of positive changes whereby Board meetings were now preceded by a meeting with one of the Associations within the University, and meetings were generally open to anyone. The Board was further presented as working collaboratively with the President and the Chancellor. "Actually, they call them

the three musketeers, the three amigos. They all buy into the mission and vision of where they're going."

The importance of these positive relations was felt to be critical particularly in times of renewal, seen to be more demanding on individuals at all levels within the institution. "It's important [to work together] because the University is a place of incredible energy. If everyone is focussed you have a powerhouse, just like a laser, and that's the objective of the three of us." A total turnaround occurred in the Board of Governors' role within the institution. A negative, adversarial relationship was replaced by a climate of mutual respect and support. Harmonious relations between the President and the Board were seen by many respondents to be critical to the health of the University.

Faculty. While it was still held, as in Phase 1, that faculty members had big egos and that they were conservative, a much gentler picture emerged, particularly concerning collegiality, which had been seen as sorely lacking in 1991. "I can tell you that we're one of the few universities in Canada that can claim that we truly have a collegial atmosphere here."

Respondents were very aware of the need for high levels of collegiality, and several worried that faculty renewal might detrimentally affect it, if it were not handled carefully. "We're not all terrific people, some have significant weaknesses. I think it's important that the person who comes in has to blend with the current group." As in Phase 1, academia was presented as a difficult career. "I think you would be hard pressed to find a majority to say that academia has been outstanding in the last 10 years." As mentioned earlier, the interviews of faculty members also revealed a pervasive and deep commitment to the University and to its continued development. "Don't ever underestimate our commitment to this place."

Non-academic and support. Generally, relations between non-academic and support staff, and deans and faculty appeared to have improved significantly. Support and technical staff in particular reportedly had been cut to the bone, leaving some support functions understaffed and incapable of meeting their service commitments. One respondent lauded her faculty's decision to retain technical staff. "I think we were fortunate that very good decisions were made about where to cut. . . . We decided to keep our computer and network support people and they're absolutely essential now." Collegiality appeared as extending more and more to other levels of staff within the University. This collegiality was even reportedly reflected in a recent round of collective bargaining, which had been conducted in a much more respectful manner.

External

Provincial Government Involvement

The classification of responses in this category contains three principal groupings, namely funding, sector planning, and direct intervention.

Funding. Broad discussions of fiscal arrangements between the province and universities in Phase 1 were replaced by a more limited discussion of the finer points of funding formulae. For example, one respondent felt that funding should be based on actual numbers of students rather than full-time equivalent counts. "Three part-time students equal one full-time student. Three students register, three students buy books, three students park, three students use the library, three students use whatever the resources are, we're only given credit for one."

The reliance on increased levels of fundraising also appeared to have gained some level of reluctant acceptance. It was still felt, however, that the U of A was being penalized relative to newer campuses with fewer capital liabilities. "We still have a huge capital liability in this place relative to the age of our buildings."

Overall, respondents appeared to be unhappy with the fiscal effort of the province in relation to the University, but they appeared less concerned that more cuts would be forthcoming. They also appeared to have largely accepted that funding levels would not return to previous levels in the near future.

Sector planning. While the KPIs (key performance indicators) and the Access Fund appeared, to several respondents, to have been an attempt to establish a sector plan, they were not perceived as an appropriate vehicle. The Other–External respondent felt that, although there was more to do in this area, much had been accomplished. "Ten years ago, we talked about a system and it wasn't a system. There were 29 institutions in those days. We're down a few now and I think we're closer to becoming a system." It was also seen to be important that the University was recognizing its sector-wide role. "They were active participants in our public consultation. They took a very constructive approach." It appeared from the comments that the University was widely perceived to be playing a leadership role in the development of a sector-wide system plan, and that the province had been successful in initiating productive dialogue through its consultation process. But much work was seen to remain.

Direct intervention. Although there was still much evidence of suspicion by faculty of government motives, comments were much more positive overall. "I had a lot to do with Minister Jack Ady [former Minister of Advanced Education and Career Development] and he stopped a number of things that could have been terrible. He had a very good staff."

There were voices both for and against the Access Fund, described in Andrews, Holdaway, and Mowat (1997) as a fund "established to finance program proposals that focus on innovative cost-effective methods and partnerships that increase learning opportunities and access for Albertans" (p. 84). One respondent felt that it had not been a desirable initiative. "I think that they tried to address

many issues with it, that in fact it was the wrong vehicle. Also, they found out that there may be far more appropriate ways to bring about change in the system." Another interviewee disagreed, stating that the Access Fund had generated constructive competition among the province's post-secondary institutions, and that it had gotten them interested in areas which had been neglected, but which were nonetheless perceived by government, or the public, to be important. "It generated some pretty constructive competition and stimulated those areas where the government thought that things had to be done, but universities haven't been listening quite that well."

As mentioned earlier in the analysis, KPIs were not well accepted and there was mistrust relative to the government actually carrying forward with the KPIs, since they appeared to place the U of A in an advantageous position relative to the other universities in the province.

While it can be said that the relationship with government had improved overall, it still appeared as an exaggeration to say that it was good.

Other Players

Business. There was concern on the part of faculty members that government might be misinterpreting messages from business, or that business might be sending mixed messages, a theme raised in Phase 1. One respondent stated that business leaders did not want job training from the University, but rather that they were demanding critical thinking skills and an ability to learn and adapt. She reminded business leaders of their responsibility to put forward a clear and consistent statement of their expectations. "I think there's an onus on industry to keep very clearly in their mind what they expect from us, and not to turn around and tell us that this student doesn't know how to use this particular instrument." Also carried over was the perception that the private sector was not educated to the

ways of the University, and that the government was too attentive to the wrong message from business. Other interviewees expressed concerns about private funding for research which were reported earlier.

Federal government. One respondent summarized the concerns expressed by faculty members about reduced funding for University research: "You can't compensate for lack of research dollars and if I look at the major research councils . . . the federal government has just not made the kind of commitment that it was required to make for us to be internationally competitive."

Resilience

In the current environment of accelerated change, seen to extend into the foreseeable future (Leslie & Fretwell, 1986; Emberley, 1996; and others), the notions of the institution's adaptability and its ability to withstand fiscal and other pressures appeared as an important determinant of that institution's future success. It was also evident in the literature that resilience means different things in different contexts. As part of Phase 2, interviewees were asked to comment on the University's resilience in the face of future change.

Respondents generally felt that the University had shown a great deal of resilience in the intervening years, largely due to the quality and commitment of its faculty. "I believe that the University is very resilient in the sense that . . . we have a critical number of outstanding scholars and as long as you have that, there is resilience there which will overcome many difficulties."

Another interviewee felt that, while the University was resilient, it could not survive another major decrease in funding. "I think that if we had another huge financial crunch, that it would be very difficult to maintain the kind of impetus that we have going right now." The same respondent saw the hiring of many new faculty members as strengthening the University's resilience. "Younger staff

come, they take it where it is, and I think we have to count on that renewal and the intense energy that the new faculty bring to us as a huge, huge resource." He went on to define resilience as situational, but he nonetheless felt that the University was much more receptive to and capable of effecting change than it had been in the past.

A third interviewee felt that the University would continue to be resilient as long as people within it continued to question direction, structures, policies, and practices. This type of strategic questioning was seen to be the main by-product of the very painful restructuring process that had endured throughout the intervening years.

Finally, collegiality and the commitment of faculty to their profession and their University appeared as a key component. Managing this collegiality and developing and fostering those commitments appeared as key roles for the key decision makers within the University.

Summary of Findings

This summary takes up the themes raised in the summary of Phase 1 interviews and addresses them from the perspective of the 1997 data.

Decision making processes within the University were seen to have improved dramatically, in part through streamlining of committee structures, in part through the development of clear strategic objectives and plans, and in part through an improvement in the will and skill of deans in making decisions in the best interests of the University as a whole. It was also widely perceived that the strategic plan was being carried forward in resource allocation and decision making, according to the strategic management model described by Gray (1986).

The province's role in seeking greater accountability through the establishment of key performance indicators was criticized (Marino, 1995, p. 218),

although it was recognized that accountability measures were far more important than they had been perceived to be in the past. The province was also seen to be moving the University in the direction of utilitarianism in the form of job readiness and applied research, a trend which was strongly condemned by interviewees within the University.

The Board of Governors, viewed as a source of disharmony in 1991, was presented in 1997 as contributing to the development and advancement of the University. The 1991-2 data had highlighted problems in the potential scope of involvement of the Board in micromanaging the University. The Board was now perceived to have assumed its legitimate policy role.

Also there had been a perception in Phase 1 that the University was poorly managed. Deans and chairs were now seen to have become a much stronger managerial presence in the University. The current executive leadership team (Vice-Presidents and Associate Vice-Presidents) was also perceived to be very capable, although it was felt that its members were overworked. Stress and overwork were also reported among deans and chairs, faculty, non-academic and support staff, and students.

Academics were described in much more flattering terms during second interviews than in the first. Terms such as "big egos" and "conservative" were used more as endearing idiosyncrasies than as demeaning epithets, as they had been in Phase 1. Overall, academics were presented as dedicated, hard-working colleagues deeply committed to the advancement and transmission of knowledge in their disciplines. There was concern that the faculty renewal initiative, although inherently exciting and positive, might nonetheless create morale and financial issues down the road. Non-academic and support staff appeared more as valued colleagues, a major turnaround from 1991. Collegiality at all levels within the University was seen to have improved dramatically.

Leadership at the level of the President appeared as falling short of the ideal. President Davenport was perceived as a technocrat lacking in interpersonal skills, in finesse, and in humanitarianism. His lack of connectedness to the academic community and his failure to stand up to the Board Chair's forcefulness were seen to have been his undoing. Nonetheless, it was widely perceived that the strategic plan developed during his presidency was a critical part of the renewal of the University throughout the period. The commitment of persons within the University, nurtured by former President Horowitz and academic leaders such as Henry Kreisel (Chair of the President's Advisory Committee on Campus Review), appeared to have also greatly contributed to the turnaround and to the perceived resilience of the University. President Fraser was seen to be off on a mission and to have left the management of the University to his executive leadership team. That team was widely perceived to be very solid and very capable. President Fraser appeared as having faltered initially in not acknowledging the strategic plan in place within the University. He was also perceived by some respondents as difficult to communicate with.

Despite all the expressions of doom and gloom in 1991 and the general feeling that the sky was falling, the bulk of the cuts had not yet hit the University at that time. Respondents were unanimous in stating that the intervening years had been very difficult and that much suffering had been experienced as a result of cuts and restructuring. They were also unanimous, however, in the feeling that the University had emerged stronger, leaner, more connected to its various constituencies, and more focussed on students and on excellence in research and teaching. It was also widely held that the University had rediscovered its ability to question and to challenge itself on an ongoing basis. This was seen to present opportunities for continued change and adaptation, identified by Pascale (1990) as the "transcend" axis.

It was also interesting to note that while respondents (and particularly faculty respondents) continued to be very critical of some facets of the University, there was a different undertone in 1997, less one of total frustration and despair, and more one of being involved in a constructive dialogue. Indeed, the existence of these voices of contention appeared as essential to continuous renewal. That these respondents still appeared to care enough to devote time and energy to improving the University, despite years of frustration, was seen to speak highly of their level of commitment. The renewal at the dean and chair levels also appeared to stem from this deep faculty commitment.

Leadership within the University was presented as having been assumed at all levels. And the fit and split characteristics identified by Pascale (1990) appeared as having found a much healthier balance, "a new homeostasis," as one interviewee had predicted in Phase 1. For example, the strategic plan was seen to be serving as a strong binding device, within which departments and faculties could operate with high levels of autonomy, but without losing sight of their interconnectedness. Likewise, committee structures were streamlined to facilitate timely decision making. Further, the Board of Governors, the President, and Chancellor were seen to be working together in the pursuit of common goals.

It was not an exaggeration in 1997 to state that the University was perceived as having reinvented itself as a much better, much more focussed, and much more widely appreciated community institution. The transformation was presented as a very complex, multifaceted process which had been driven by leaders at various levels (President, executive leadership, deans/chairs, faculty, non-academic staff, students, Board, provincial government, etc.). It appeared that the loyalty developed by previous presidents and academic leaders had been instrumental in carrying forward the renewal, in some cases almost despite the leadership in place, whose actions could have been devastating in the absence of this commitment.

Hence, faculty commitment to the University appeared as a critical element in the renewal. Also, the importance of strong Vice-Presidents, deans and chairs working towards a central vision could not be overstated.

While it was acknowledged that constituent relations had improved dramatically over the five-year period, respondents felt that they must enjoy a continued high level of priority. It was widely held that constituent relations were key in ensuring that the University received proper support from governments, business, and the public. Good community relations were also seen as a protection against further cutbacks.

In summary, while it is difficult to point to any one thing as the key factor in renewal, certain themes emerged very clearly, including more capable and stronger deans and chairs, strong executive committee leadership, strategic planning and management, structural adjustments to committee structures, harmonious relations with the Board, faculty commitment, faculty renewal initiatives, effective external relations, and excellence in research and teaching.

There can be no doubt that the February 1991 restructuring document presented by President Davenport shook the University to its foundations and got the process of renewal underway. But it might have irreparably demoralized lesser people and ultimately destroyed a lesser institution.

CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The findings from Phases 1 and 2 provided insights into the perceptions of key informants on the questions identified at the outset. In this chapter, those findings are contrasted and discussed according to the general headings in the framework for analysis used throughout the study, namely, governance, management, and leadership for the internal classification, and provincial government involvement, and other players for the external. Conclusions at various points in the discussions are highlighted and numbered and they are provided in a summary of conclusions at the end of the chapter. This summary of conclusions provides insight into various facets of the main research question for the study: "In addressing what was perceived to be a major financial crisis, was the University of Alberta perceived to have responded appropriately and adequately to the issues it was facing from 1991 to 1997?"

The period from 1991 to 1997 was very difficult for the University, in part because of severe funding cutbacks and the accelerated change that they brought about, and in part because of a host of other issues and concerns. Indeed, it became apparent very early in the study that change was primarily being driven by budget shortfalls, and that the initial budgetary crisis had created an acceptance of change that had not existed to that point. It also became apparent early in the study that there were many other issues which constituted imperatives for change. Generally, the University was seen to be much stronger and more resilient (Leslie & Fretwell, 1996, pp. 245-257) at the end of the period. It was also widely held that, at the end of the period, new issues and concerns were emerging in relation to

the faculty renewal program and, to a lesser extent, the new President's emphasis on fundraising and internationalization.

Conclusion 1: The financial crisis of 1991 and the February 1991 document Maintaining Excellence and Accessibility in an Environment of Budgetary Restraint were critical in creating a greater acceptance of change.

Internal

Governance

In discussing universities in general, interviewees in both Phases 1 and 2 presented them as large and complex organizations inherently conservative in decision making and hence, slow to embrace change. While this was seen by some of those interviewed as protecting the University from overreactions to social issues as outlined in D'Souza (1992), Emberley (1996), and Bercuson, Bothwell, and Granatstein (1997), or from government priorities for job creation referred to in a Public Affairs Management study (1991, p. 7), the conservative nature of universities appeared inconsistent with Drucker's (1993, pp. 59-60) view that modern organizations must be open to innovation and change and that they must build the management of change into their very structure. Morrison (1987, p. 7), in his discussion of Universities and open learning, viewed this conservatism as a major liability. He called for a "new perceptual framework" (Morrison, 1989, p. 1) and a more open and adaptive approach. The view of universities as conservative institutions appeared to apply to the University of Alberta more in 1991 than in 1997, when many profound changes to the institution had taken place.

Respondents reported a significant increase in individuals' and the University's readiness for change throughout the period. They also reported that, while the initial impetus for change was seen to have come from the fiscal crisis, other factors had come to the fore, including a reported improvement at the level

of deans and chairs, faculty renewal, and, perhaps most importantly, the development of a new strategic plan. A streamlining of governance mechanisms was also presented as having improved the University's ability to make timely decisions. In its development throughout the period, the University appeared to move closer to the characteristics of a learning organization outlined in Drucker (1993, pp. 48-67).

While there were some criticisms of universities' insularity in Phase 1, the scope and nature of recorded criticisms were a far cry from the charges of wanton disregard for the public and for public interests recorded in Bérubé and Nelson (1995), Lasch, (1995), and Emberley (1996).

One theme which did surface both in the literature and in the interviews was the decline in universities' prestige, which Nevitte (1996) called the decline of deference. This was seen by Balderston (1995) to have weakened universities' ability to "press claims on society" (p. 3). Interviewees generally agreed that the University of Alberta, throughout much of this period, had had to temper its reactions to government, to avoid what was felt would have been a huge backlash. More specifically, it was felt that the University did not enjoy the support from its constituents in 1991 (public, business, or government) that would have allowed it to successfully challenge funding cuts, as the health and education sectors had been able to do during the same period. While levels of support for the University were seen to have improved in 1997, constituent relations were still seen by many interviewees to be in need of greater and more constant attention.

In 1991, those interviewed were concerned specifically that the University rebuild its relationship with the public and government, and hence that it regain its lobbying power, seen to have eroded significantly. Leslie and Fretwell (1992) also cautioned that "Good feedback from the external world should be sought continuously" (p. 229).

Conclusion 2: Improving constituent relations was identified as a major, ongoing strategic focus for the institution.

Respondents felt strongly that constituent relations should be consistently addressed at all levels within the University, and that they should be a major focus for the President.

In 1991, "decision paralysis" within the University was seen by the respondents to be a major impediment to change. The causes of this paralysis were consistent with problems identified in the literature, namely the complexity of governance structures (Millard, 1991, p. 33), the lack of common vision (Leslie & Fretwell, 1996, pp. 127-8), and competing power sources, i.e., positional versus academic authority systems (Smith, 1992, p. 4). Respondents also cited the inertia generated by the "old boys' network" and their ability to successfully tie up decision making structures. Tensions between the President, the Board, and the academic community from 1991 to 1994 were also presented as a contributing factor.

Conclusion 3: In 1991, the University of Alberta was portrayed as having been largely unable to change in response to internal and external pressures.

That situation appeared to have been changed in 1997, through a combination of better suited and more capable people in leadership positions, particularly at the dean and chair levels, streamlined procedures, and a clear strategic focus. It appeared somewhat ironic that the renewal in decision making within the University was launched by President Davenport's 1991 cuts to faculties and administrative units, widely perceived to have been very undemocratic and heavy-handed. This may have served as a reminder that in the absence of functioning democratic decision making structures within the University, other alternatives would emerge. Emberley (1996, p. 126) sounded that very warning.

Conclusion 4: Improved leadership, clear strategic focus, and harmonious relations between the President and the Board Chair were seen to be key factors in overcoming the decision paralysis reported in 1991. The streamlining of governance mechanisms within the University was also seen as a contributing factor.

A clearer sense of vision and purpose was perceived to exist in 1997, which was seen to bring with it a high level of individual commitment to the University. However, that commitment was also evident in 1991 when the overall direction of the institution was far murkier. Commitment of individuals within the University thus emerged as a key residual strength of the University in addressing the challenges it faced throughout the period. Much of this commitment was traced back to the leadership of former President Horowitz and of key faculty members of the time. A few interviewees wondered whether this same level of commitment would be shared by new colleagues hired as part of the faculty renewal program. Hardy (1996) presented collegiality as a powerful force in the governance of universities, and an alternative to the managerialistic models being imposed on universities. Emberley (1996) likewise discussed academic responsibility as requiring that faculty participate in decision making within their institutions in a collegial and meaningful manner. In the end, faculty member commitment was instrumental in overcoming the negativity of the "old boys" and the discouragement engendered by President Davenport's forceful approaches.

Conclusion 5: Faculty commitment to the University and faculty collegiality emerged as key residual strengths of the University of Alberta.

It was seen to be the responsibility of the President and other key figures within the University to develop this sense of belonging to the institution. In this instance, commitment and collegiality were traced back to the former President and key academic leaders. Presidents Davenport and Fraser were not perceived to

have been able to "build a covenant" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988, p. 205) in this way, although it was reported that the current Vice-President was exercising inspired leadership.

Conclusion 6: The development of a strong sense of commitment to the University, judged by respondents to be a key factor in the turnaround at the University, was seen to be a key role of the president and executive leadership within the University.

It was reported that collegiality had been developed by leaders who had exhibited excellent abilities to communicate effectively with faculty and who were respected as academics within the institution. For example, the fact the Dr. Horowitz had continued to teach during his presidency was cited as an important factor in attracting the support and respect of academics within the University.

In considering roles within the University, there were many changes from 1991 to 1997, but there were some constants as well. One constant was the perceived high level of student involvement in decision making. Another constant was the importance of deans and chairs in directing "the most significant unit in the University" (Gmelch, 1991, p. 23). The quality of deans and chairs was widely seen to have improved significantly, and deans appeared to gain ascendency over chairs as the most important members of the administration.

The level of confidence in the ability of deans and chairs to manage their units effectively appeared to have increased dramatically, with less mention being made of the difficulty in attracting faculty members into those positions. Respondents also reported that improvements at the level of deans and chairs had been critical in the turnaround at the University.

Conclusion 7: Deans and chairs were presented as being key to the strength of the University.

Changes included a more significant role for the Senate and of the Chancellor in particular, a new President supported by a cast of highly respected Vice-Presidents and Associate Vice-Presidents, and perhaps most importantly, a new Board Chair who had redefined the role of the Board away from micromanagement, and more towards policy decision making.

More than any one role, it appeared in the study that the ability of key players to work together in harmony, and to each contribute from their perspectives was most important in achieving positive growth within the University. During the intervening period, the open hostility between the Board and the President was replaced by a high level of cooperation in all aspects of their relationship. The Board was no longer seen in 1997 as an arm of government bent on imposing private-sector-style management within the institution. Also, the political acumen of the Chancellor was seen as a useful complement to the strengths of the Board Chair and the President. Further, the Vice-President (Academic) was seen to be capably running the University on a day-to-day basis.

Conclusion 8: Cooperative relationships between the Board of Governors and the President appeared in this study as an important factor in the health of the institution.

The ability of a complex organization like a university with so many different streams of power and such a great disparity of views to move forward, appeared tied to its ability to "harness rather than suppress" (Pascale, 1990, p. 25) the diversity within it, or alternatively, to prevent diversity from becoming a force for disaggregation of the University, rather than the strength it should represent.

Management

Interviewees' views in 1991 that funding reductions were not a passing fad were borne out in the next three years with an additional 20 percent of government

funding being cut back during that period. This was confirmed for the university sector in general in Statistics Canada (1998) data on funding levels to Canadian universities. Doing more with less was presented as a consistent theme (Andrews, 1992, p. 19). It is not surprising in this context that fundraising appeared as an emergent priority of the two Presidents in the intervening years. On a trip to the University in July 1998, I overheard a conversation in an elevator between a chair and a faculty member, centred on a lapel pin worn by the chair which read: "We care about students." They both stated that all the University cared about of late was fundraising. President Fraser was seen to have been brought in with the main focus of expanding the University's revenue base. Not surprisingly, this prompted concerns that the University not "sell out" to corporate interests. It was very clear for all interviewees, however, that fundraising would have to be an important preoccupation of any University administration.

Conclusion 9: Fundraising emerged in the 1990s as part of the new fiscal reality at the University of Alberta. Respondents called for clearer policies on private funding to minimize potential negative impacts in such areas as basic research, research in the humanities, and infrastructure support.

One theme that moved from the limelight was the poor quality of management within the University. The only comment about management of funds in Phase 2 concerned the limitations on flexibility imposed by the government (enrolment corridors, and control of tuition). Respondents in Phase 2 appeared satisfied that funds were being effectively managed within those government-imposed constraints.

The practice of deferring building maintenance, which Leslie and Fretwell (1996, p. 180) and others had condemned, and which had been present in 1991, was no longer commented on to the same extent in 1997. Some interviewees felt that the University was wasting money on new technology, in part by constantly

replacing central systems, and in part by purchasing classroom technology and not providing adequate support to faculty for its use in their classrooms. One respondent referred to an "albatross" of capital expenditures circling the University but most respondents in 1997 felt that matters were well in hand in this area.

Comments from interviewees within the University demonstrated on the whole that much thought was being given to personnel matters on an ongoing basis. Overall, a sense of excitement and anticipation replaced what had been feelings of anger, helplessness, and resentment so clearly evidenced in 1991. Common issues included time pressures on executive leaders, seen in 1997 to also extend to deans, chairs, faculty, and students; a greater incidence of court cases surrounding personnel matters; and a requirement for better preparation of deans and chairs, echoed in Gmelch and Miskin (1993), Booth (1982), and Cowan (1994). Many concerns were expressed relative to faculty renewal, seen by many interviewees to be an important emergent area of concern, albeit one that also held great promise.

In 1997, morale was higher, a sense of excitement pervaded the University, and everyone within the University appeared to be working at or beyond their capacity. It thus appeared likely that increased incidences of stress-related illnesses might prevail in the future, especially after the early retirement window was closed as a means of departing the institution.

Conclusion 10: Faculty renewal was generally seen to be an opportunity to recruit knowledgeable, thoughtful, and deeply committed colleagues who would strengthen the University. Personnel issues within the University were presented as numerous and complex, and as requiring consistently high levels of attention.

While the quality of deans and chairs was seen to have improved, their selection and preparation appeared in the study and in the literature as requiring constant attention. Faculty renewal was seen to be creating issues in relation to

remaining faculty members which were not being addressed. And stress levels within the University due to higher workloads also appeared as an important issue.

Charges of poor management, decision paralysis, haphazard planning, arbitrary resource allocation, and poor administration of rewards which had permeated Phase 1, were generally replaced by more positive perceptions. More specifically, interviewees in 1997 supported the view that the University was well-managed, according to longer-term goals (strategic plan) and short-term plans flowing from this longer-term perspective. As a result, planning and resource allocation were seen to be more predictable and immeasurably more trustworthy. Also noted were a number of positive policy innovations, particularly in the human resources area.

While the strategic plan and the executive team's efforts to tie its decision making to that plan were important factors in effecting this turnaround, so was the credibility of several members of the executive leadership team, and most recently the Vice-President (Academic), who was widely respected as a capable steward of the University's resources. Also significant was the obvious harmony between the President, the Board Chair, and the Chancellor, each of whom was seen to be supporting and reinforcing the other two. It was, however, surprising to note that these improved perspectives were not attributed to either of the two Presidents during the intervening years, a finding which will be further discussed later in the analysis.

As was pointed out earlier in this discussion, both internal and external accountability measures were recognized as critically important to the credibility of the University, a view supported by Emberley (1996, p. 265), Vroeijenstijn (1995, p. 18), and Berkovitz (1995, p. 6). Respondents from within the University were unanimous in questioning the validity of the key performance indicators (KPIs) developed by the provincial government. Further, many saw the KPIs as

nothing more than an intrusive tool aimed at interfering in the internal workings of the University. Likewise, the Maclean's magazine criteria were not afforded much credibility although it was recognized that evaluative materials such as were provided by the magazine could be of use to students in selecting a post-secondary institution. Emberley (1996, pp. 131, 133) and Page (1995, 1996) provided a detailed discussion of the shortcomings of the Maclean's model in particular. At the time of the interviews in 1997, the University was about to release its own performance measurement instruments, a development which was welcomed by many of the study respondents, including the Other–External respondent in Phase 2.

Conclusion 11: Overall, the need for measures of accountability, which could assist the University in explaining itself to the public and to its funders, was seen to be much more legitimate in 1997 than had been the case in 1991.

People within the University acknowledged that the institution must be concerned with relations with both internal and external constituencies and that it must be able to clearly articulate its vision and support its progress towards achievement of that vision through meaningful accountability measures.

One clear finding in this study was the importance of the strategic planning process in effecting the turnaround at the University of Alberta. Respondent after respondent presented the plan as the key underlying force within the University. This was in sharp contrast to the views expressed by Hardy (1996) and Bercuson, Bothwell, and Granatstein (1997), who complained that far too much time was being wasted on useless strategic planning. At the University of Alberta, the strategic plan which was adopted in 1994 was presented as driving decision making and resource allocation processes, providing a sense of order, predictability, and reliability which greatly enhanced the credibility of decision makers and of their decisions, and the overall sentiment that the University was

being well run. The importance of the strategic plan in the governance of the University was made clear in President Fraser's early days in his position. The fact that he was seen to be unfamiliar with elements of the Degrees of Freedom document initially caused him to lose some credibility with some key people within the institution.

It appeared from the interviews that the process of developing and approving the plan and its subsequent use in decision making all contributed to its acceptance and to its credibility. Also, as Holdaway and Meekison (1990) pointed out, the plan was built around the environmental constraints in place at the time. This appeared as a key failing of the earlier strategic plan (1987) which seemed to many interviewees to be more appropriate to an earlier time of plentiful resources. This lack of connectedness of the earlier plan to the reality of the day appeared to be consistent with criticisms of the University as an isolated institution, so prominent in Phase 1 and so present in much of the literature on University governance, management, and leadership.

Conclusion 12: The strategic plan, developed in 1994 with significant input from all parts of the University, and its subsequent use in decision making and resource allocation, were key factors in creating the perception that the University was well managed and that its decision making processes were trustworthy.

The directions provided by the strategic plan appeared to positively impact attitudes towards students and accessibility. In keeping with its generally improved constituent relations, the University was seen as having become much more responsible to student needs. Leslie and Fretwell (1996, p. 245) identified responsiveness to student needs as a key component in institutional resilience.

Where the discussion in Phase 1 had centred in large part on restricting access and enrolment management, Phase 2 interviewees discussed ways of making the University more accessible through distance education and off-campus

offerings. This was consistent with the increased emphasis on serving student and community needs discussed earlier. It was also consistent with the views put forward by Morrison (1989) and others that universities had to become more creative in embracing a broader range of student needs.

Conclusion 13: The University of Alberta was seen to have become more sensitive to the needs of students and communities in Alberta during this period.

Some issues were reported in relation to tenure and research. It appeared from the analysis of Phase 1 and Phase 2 data that issues around tenure had tended to intensify in troubled times and to diminish in times of stability. It was also clear that questions around tenure as unfettered job security were always present, although their visibility appeared to mirror the state of turmoil within the institution. As in much of the literature, criticisms of tenure appeared more as criticisms of the management of tenure or of the academic responsibility of faculty members. Although this latter concern was not raised in Phase 2, not unlike "basic research" discussed in the next section, tenure appeared to carry its own mythology which made it difficult to question it, to discuss it, or to explain it to external constituents (Bercuson, Bothwell, & Granatstein, 1997). Yet, it appeared as a topic requiring ongoing discussion and review within the University, since it was very clear both in the interviews and in the literature that it was deeply rooted in the very essence of universities, and likewise that it was often misunderstood as unfettered job security both outside and within the University.

Issues related to research were among the most consistent from Phase 1 to Phase 2. Interviewees stressed the importance of basic research and they expressed concerns that increased private funding might lead to more utilitarian research, an approach which Millard (1991) viewed as "amazingly shortsighted" (p. 244). Basic research was also identified by internal respondents as misunderstood by many constituents outside the University. Students worried that

the heavy emphasis on research within the University, most notably in reward systems, was detracting from the quality of teaching within the institution.

Interviewees in Phase 2 recognized that much had been done to promote the value of research to various constituencies (business, local and provincial governments, the community). Several cited the "Research Makes Sense" campaign organized by the Vice-President (Research) as particularly successful. In the intervening years the University was very successful in attracting a larger share of research funds from federal funding agencies and the private sector. Several interviewees worried that the approach to funding "superstar" researchers would have detrimental effects on teaching and faculty member morale.

In both Phases of the study, research appeared as a component of the University that required concerted and ongoing attention if it were ever to be fully legitimized to the general public. Interviewees were particularly defensive whenever they discussed the merits of basic research. What constitutes good basic research appeared difficult to define and explain, and hence, respondents did not appear to be prepared to judge basic research efforts on their merits. As Smith (1990, p. 7) pointed out in his attack on basic research, this failure to discern between good and bad basic research was exacting a heavy toll in terms of constituent support and institutional credibility, and it may have contributed to the decline in support being experienced by the university sector in general.

Conclusion 14: Tenure and basic research appeared in the study as difficult to communicate outside the University. They were also perceived by internal respondents to be misunderstood and undervalued by external constituents.

Leadership

When contrasting definitions of leadership developed by Trow (1985) and Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) with the leadership of successive Presidents at the

University of Alberta, some shortcomings emerged. President Davenport, under whose regime most of the restructuring occurred and the strategic plan was developed, did not appear as a great leader. His image within the University was that of a technocrat (Pitcher, 1996, pp. 109-119), somewhat lacking in people skills. Nor was he seen to be particularly adept at selecting his executive team, with the possible exceptions of the Vice-Presidents (Research) and (Finance).

President Fraser, "another economist," was not credited with outstanding people skills. His executive committee and particularly the Vice-President (Academic) were seen to be very strong and well-respected. President Fraser's fundraising initiatives and his work on internationalization were seen to occupy much of his time, leaving the day-to-day management of the institution to the executive committee. While no respondent expressed any reservations about this, several did question the limited effort being deployed in promoting the University with local constituents (local and provincial governments, local business, local communities). As reported in Conclusion 2, respondents in the study were unanimous in stating that constituent relations needed to be a much higher priority than they had been heretofore.

President Horowitz, who preceded President Davenport, was presented as best embodying the leadership characteristics in Trow (1985) and Emberley (1996). He was in large measure credited with having strengthened academics' commitment to the University. Yet his tenure was not without its issues. Issues relative to his relationship with government and local constituents were presented. It was also stated that he had been slow to adapt to new fiscal realities.

What appeared almost contradictory is that the major turnaround that was seen to have occurred drew heavily on the strategic planning process, developed during the tenure of the least popular President in recent history. Clearly, other forces were at play. On the basis of the level of commitment and involvement of

the people interviewed for the study, those forces appeared to be the collective will and dedication to the University of deans, chairs, faculty members, and other staff. During the interviews, it was very clear that President Horowitz had been instrumental in developing that commitment. President Davenport, on the other hand, could at most be credited with having shaken people out of their complacency and forced them to act.

Conclusion 15: In the case of the University of Alberta, effective leadership did not appear to come solely from a single leader, but rather it was diffused throughout the institution in a number of dedicated key people who were able to use existing processes to move the University forward.

The literature was consistent with respondent views of the positions of deans and chairs as critically important within the University (see Conclusion 7).

The Senate was not presented as having played a major role throughout the period, although the Chancellor was singled out as a very capable and politically astute individual. The Board was perceived to have made a complete about-face, changing from being seen as a closed, meddlesome body to being an open, positive force for collaboration.

There appeared to be several lessons to be drawn from these events. The first was no doubt that the Board can wield real power. This was confirmed by one respondent who described the potential power of the Board. The second, for the government, was that it must be very careful who it appoints to the Board. Respondents in 1991 saw the Board as an extension of government. The third was that the University cannot function effectively in the absence of harmony between the Board and the President (Leslie & Fretwell, 1996, p. 282).

Faculty members were presented as committed, hardworking, and somewhat difficult. Academia was seen to be a difficult, highly competitive career requiring immense investments in time and resources. Academics were likewise

presented as not being naturally drawn to administration, although this perception was expressed much less forcefully in Phase 2.

External

Provincial Government Involvement

The reductions in funding which were well documented in the literature caused many interviewees to express dissatisfaction with the fiscal effort of the province in supporting the University. Interviewees also questioned why the University of Calgary had apparently received favorable treatment, particularly in relation to its residences. Although the University's capacity to marshal public support was felt to have increased, it was still the opinion of most interviewees that there was much to do in this area (see Conclusion 2). Many respondents felt that this should be a primary focus for the President.

Conclusion 16: Interviewees were dissatisfied both with the levels of funding provided by the provincial government, and with the perceived equity of that funding, particularly in relation to the University of Calgary.

Not surprisingly, the emphasis on fundraising increased dramatically throughout the period of the study. Presidents Davenport and Fraser were thought to have been selected largely because of their proven abilities in this area. Many of the concerns voiced in relation to private funding of research were also raised relative to fundraising. In 1997, no further cuts were felt to be looming and funding was seen to have stabilized at a level that would require an ongoing fundraising effort.

The absence of a sector-wide plan was seen as a major issue in 1991. In 1997, concern had abated significantly although there were still concerns that the government was trying to control institutions through key performance indicators while failing to assume its responsibilities in sector planning. During the

intervening period, the government did conduct a broad public consultation on future directions for public education, but the level of mistrust of the provincial government and its bureaucracy remained high throughout the University.

Conclusion 17: The provincial government was not seen to be playing an appropriate role in sector planning. Its introduction of key performance indicators was widely viewed by interviewees as an attempt to control the University in an underhanded way.

Other Players

As underlined earlier, respondents questioned business leaders' level of understanding of the University. Interviewees worried that the University might succumb to pressures for more utilitarian teaching and research. Also, the federal government was condemned for decreasing funding levels for research.

Resilience

Commitment of faculty to the University appeared as a strong factor in effecting positive change within the University. Neither Pascale (1990) nor Leslie and Fretwell (1996) identified that commitment as a key component of resilience. This would tend to confirm the opinion of many respondents that resilience was situational and that it was not easily circumscribed in a universally applicable definition.

Conclusion 18: Assessments of resilience are situational and key factors will tend to change depending on the circumstances.

Generally, the University of Alberta was in a much better position in 1997 than it had been in 1991. The financial house was in order, a useful strategic plan was in place, management was predictable, credible governance mechanisms were working well, and morale had improved, as had relations with external and internal

constituencies alike. A positive mood of anticipation had replaced the negativity of 1991.

Conclusion 19: The answer to the principal research question in this study (In addressing what was perceived to be a major financial crisis, was the University of Alberta perceived to have responded appropriately and adequately to the issues it was facing from 1991 to 1997?) appeared to be a qualified yes, qualified because of emergent problems and because the University was still undergoing major changes in 1997, for example, in faculty renewal and in updating the institution's strategic plan.

Given the rapid rate and the scope of change predicted in the future, it appeared unlikely that the University could allow itself to settle for any length of time into the new homeostasis referred to by one respondent. Rather, a requirement for continuous change appeared to have settled over the University, which would continue to challenge its leaders, the commitment of its faculty and staff, and the inherent conservatism of the institution.

Summary of Conclusions

Conclusion 1: The financial crisis of 1991 and the February 1991 document Maintaining Excellence and Accessibility in an Environment of Budgetary Restraint were critical in creating a greater acceptance of change. Conclusion 2: Improving constituent relations was identified as a major, ongoing strategic focus for the institution.

Conclusion 3: In 1991, the University of Alberta was portrayed as having been largely unable to change in response to internal and external pressures.

Conclusion 4: Improved leadership, clear strategic focus, and harmonious relations between the President and the Board Chair were seen to be key factors in overcoming the decision paralysis reported in 1991. The streamlining of

governance mechanisms within the University was also seen as a contributing factor.

Conclusion 5: Faculty commitment to the University and faculty collegiality emerged as key residual strengths of the University of Alberta.

Conclusion 6: The development of a strong sense of commitment to the University, judged by respondents to be a key factor in the turnaround at the University, was seen to be a key role of the president and executive leadership within the University.

Conclusion 7: Deans and chairs were presented as being key to the strength of the University.

Conclusion 8: Cooperative relationships between the Board of Governors and the President appeared in this study as an important factor in the health of the institution.

Conclusion 9: Fundraising emerged in the 1990s as part of the new fiscal reality at the University of Alberta. Respondents called for clearer policies on private funding to minimize potential negative impacts in such areas as basic research, research in the humanities, and infrastructure support.

Conclusion 10: Faculty renewal was generally seen to be an opportunity to recruit knowledgeable, thoughtful, and deeply committed colleagues who would strengthen the University. Personnel issues within the University were presented as numerous and complex, and as requiring consistently high levels of attention.

Conclusion 11: Overall, the need for measures of accountability, which could assist the University in explaining itself to the public and to its funders, was seen to be much more legitimate in 1997 than had been the case in 1991.

Conclusion 12: The strategic plan, developed in 1994 with significant input from all parts of the University, and its subsequent use in decision making and

resource allocation, were key factors in creating the perception that the University was well managed and that its decision making processes were trustworthy.

Conclusion 13: The University of Alberta was seen to have become more sensitive to the needs of students and communities in Alberta during this period.

Conclusion 14: Tenure and basic research appeared in the study as difficult to communicate outside the University. They were also perceived by internal respondents to be misunderstood and undervalued by external constituents.

Conclusion 15: In the case of the University of Alberta, effective leadership did not appear to come solely from a single leader, but rather it was diffused throughout the institution in a number of dedicated key people who were able to use existing processes to move the University forward.

Conclusion 16: Interviewees were dissatisfied both with the levels of funding provided by the provincial government, and with the perceived equity of that funding, particularly in relation to the University of Calgary.

Conclusion 17: The provincial government was not seen to be playing an appropriate role in sector planning. Its introduction of key performance indicators was widely viewed by interviewees as an attempt to control the University in an underhanded way.

Conclusion 18: Assessments of resilience are situational and key factors will tend to change depending on the circumstances.

Conclusion 19: The answer to the principal research question in this study (In addressing what was perceived to be a major financial crisis, was the University of Alberta perceived to have responded appropriately and adequately to the issues it was facing from 1991 to 1997?) appeared to be a qualified yes, qualified because of emergent problems and because the University was still undergoing major changes in 1997, for example, in faculty renewal and in updating the institution's strategic plan.

CHAPTER 7

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview of the Study

In 1991, the University of Alberta announced a series of measures aimed at redressing its serious financial problems. Beginning from the assumption that there were more issues than simply a financial shortfall, the study identified a number of other issues in 1991, explored their evolution over a six-year period, and again assessed issues and concerns within the University in 1997. In short, the study looked beyond fiscal issues to a more general review of challenges facing the University of Alberta in 1991, and to their evolution over time.

A key research question guided the study, namely: In addressing what was perceived to be a major financial crisis, was the University of Alberta perceived to have responded appropriately and adequately to the issues it was facing from 1991 to 1997? In addressing this question, other questions were also explored relative to issues and challenges facing the University in 1991, changes between 1991 and 1997, and emerging issues throughout the period.

The study adopted a naturalistic, case study design, and it relied on qualitative methods for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data. Open-ended interviews were used in Phase 1 of the study in 1991 to gather perceptual data from a sample of key informants within and outside the University. A semistructured approach was used for Phase 2 in 1997 to gather similar data from a majority of the 1997 respondents. This choice of approaches to the study provided thick, rich, broadly based descriptions of many issues seen to exist within the University during the period covered by the study.

Summary of Findings

Phase 1

There was general agreement among the interviewees in Phase 1 in 1991 that the University was an "institution in transition" and that it was facing very difficult challenges. It was also widely perceived that change within the University of Alberta had largely been precipitated by the institution's financial difficulties.

The University of Alberta was presented as a largely disoriented institution in serious trouble, lacking support from government and the public, lacking direction and focus, ripped apart by internal strife, and crumbling under the weight of a stifling bureaucracy. The only cause for optimism lay in the deep commitment and dedication of the internal respondents, and in the growing realization that change was inevitable if the University was to survive.

Firstly, the University was seen as lacking a clear mission or direction. Rather, it was seen very much to be still trying to be "all things to all people." Strategic planning as it had been carried on up to that point was not seen to be of much use in decision making in a period of budgetary restraint. Planning (including human resources planning) and management were seen to be substandard within the University. Further, the absence of sector-wide planning was seen to be a major liability in terms of the University's own capacity to plan. The provincial government was presented as shirking its responsibilities while managing the University through budget allocations and key performance indicators, all the while pretending to respect institutional autonomy.

The Board of Governors was generally perceived as wanting to be more involved in the ongoing operation of the University, a function for which most

respondents felt that it was ill-equipped. Relations between the Board and the academic committees were seen to be very tense and deteriorating.

Several interviewees stated bluntly that the University was poorly managed. It was also clear from interviewees' comments that there was no strategic management approach in place within the University. This was felt to result in many structures and processes being ineffective in supporting organizational goals, themselves unclear. Several internal respondents expressed high levels of frustration with decision making processes within the University.

Although deans and chairs were seen to be a key link in the management chain, they were generally perceived to be a weak link, lacking either or both the will and skill to manage effectively. Their inability to look to the good of their institution as a whole (especially among the "old boys") was cited as an impediment to change. Likewise, their management of rewards was seen to be discouraging initiative and undermining excellence.

Academics were likewise not described in very flattering terms. Some were said to be abusing academic privilege and caring little for students. They were also presented as disconnected from their communities and immured in their ivory towers.

Non-academics and support staff appeared as the poor cousins of the institution, not taken seriously by academics and intermediate leaders, not afforded opportunities to contribute as full members of the family.

While there was consensus that academics must play a central role in university governance through collegial decision making, that collegiality was seen to be eroding and the "decision paralysis" that had set in was seen as resulting in an undermining of faculty influence.

Some respondents raised the inability of post-secondary institutions to develop a sector plan as a direct encouragement to the government to step in unilaterally.

Leaders were presented as requiring a strong knowledge of the mechanisms and processes in place and a highly developed capacity to "force" the participative process to come to a head. One major impediment to this type of balanced collegial leadership model was seen to be the inability and/or unwillingness of persons within the institution (a) to seek broad input into decisions, including input from non-academic staff, support staff, and the public, and (b) to put on their corporate hats and consider the well-being of the institution as a whole.

"Academic responsibility" was seen to be particularly critical for academics if they were to retain the major say in the strategic governance of the institution. But there were perceived to be many obstacles to a renewal of academic responsibility, which appeared as almost insurmountable, among which a new culture of competitiveness, a paucity of cooperation and sharing, an every-person-for-him-or-herself culture, and a lack of strong leadership.

While funding was seen as an important issue, it was not perceived to be the only or even the most important challenge facing the University of Alberta. It was generally perceived, however, that the February 1991 restructuring document had largely been driven by the fiscal situation within the University. It was presented as highly suspect both in terms of the appropriateness of the measures proposed and in terms of the process used to move it through the decision making structures of the University. Overall, the restructuring initiative was seen to have addressed only the objective of reducing costs, while doing virtually nothing to advance leadership and decision making within the University, nor, it was argued, strategic planning and strategic management. Recognized positive outcomes of the process

included a greater receptivity to change within the University and a broader recognition that fundamental change was inevitable.

Phase 2

Respondents were much more positive and optimistic overall in 1997 than had been the case in 1991.

Decision making processes within the University were seen to have improved dramatically, in part through streamlining of committee structures, in part through the development of clear strategic objectives and plans, and in part through an improvement in the will and skill of deans in making decisions in the best interests of the University as a whole. It was also widely perceived that the strategic plan was being carried forward in resource allocation and decision making.

The province's role in seeking greater accountability through the establishment of key performance indicators was criticized, although it was recognized that accountability measures were far more important than they had been perceived to be in the past. The province was also seen to be moving the University in the direction of utilitarianism in the form of job readiness and applied research, a trend which was strongly condemned by interviewees within the University.

The Board of Governors, viewed as a source of disharmony in 1991, was presented in 1997 as contributing to the development and advancement of the University. The 1991-2 data had highlighted problems in the potential scope of involvement of the Board in micromanaging the University. The Board was now perceived to have assumed its legitimate policy role.

Also there had been a perception in Phase 1 that the University was poorly managed. Deans and chairs were now seen to have become a much stronger

managerial presence in the University. The current executive leadership team (Vice-Presidents and Associate Vice-Presidents) was also perceived to be very capable, although it was felt that its members were overworked. Stress and overwork were also reported among deans and chairs, faculty, non-academic and support staff, and students.

Academics were described in much more flattering terms during second interviews than in the first. There was concern that the faculty renewal initiative, although inherently exciting and positive, might nonetheless create morale and financial issues down the road. Non-academic and support staff appeared more as valued colleagues, a major turnaround from 1991. Collegiality at all levels within the University was seen to have improved dramatically.

Leadership at the level of the President appeared as falling short of the ideal. President Davenport was perceived as a technocrat lacking in interpersonal skills, in finesse, and in humanitarianism. Nonetheless, it was widely perceived that the strategic plan developed during his presidency was a critical part of the renewal of the University throughout the period. The commitment of persons within the University, nurtured by former President Horowitz and academic leaders such as Henry Kreisel (Chair of the President's Advisory Committee on Campus Review), appeared to have also greatly contributed to the turnaround and to the perceived resilience of the University. President Fraser was seen to be off on a mission and to have left the management of the University to his very capable executive leadership team. He also appeared as having faltered initially in not acknowledging the strategic plan in place within the University.

Despite all the expressions of doom and gloom in 1991, the bulk of the cuts had not yet hit the University at that time. Respondents were unanimous in stating that the intervening years had been very difficult and that much suffering had been experienced as a result of cuts and restructuring. They were also unanimous,

however, in the feeling that the University had emerged stronger, leaner, more connected to its various constituencies, and more focussed on students and on excellence in research and teaching. It was also widely held that the University had rediscovered its ability to question and to challenge itself on an ongoing basis.

It was interesting to note that while respondents (and particularly faculty respondents) continued to be very critical of some facets of the University, there was a different undertone in 1997, less one of total frustration and despair, and more one of being involved in a constructive dialogue. Indeed, the existence of these voices of contention appeared as essential to continuous renewal.

It was not an exaggeration in 1997 to state that the University was perceived as having reinvented itself as a much better, much more focussed, and much more widely appreciated community institution. The transformation was presented as a very complex, multifaceted process which had been driven by leaders at various levels (President, executive leadership, deans/chairs, faculty, non-academic staff, students, Board, provincial government, etc.). It appeared that the loyalty developed by previous presidents and academic leaders had been instrumental in carrying forward the renewal, in some cases almost despite the leadership in place, whose actions could have been devastating in the absence of this commitment. Hence, faculty commitment to the University appeared as a critical element in the renewal. Also, the importance of strong Vice-Presidents, deans and chairs working towards a central vision could not be overstated.

While it was acknowledged that constituent relations had improved dramatically over the five-year period, respondents felt that they must enjoy a continued high level of priority. It was widely held that constituent relations were key in ensuring that the University received proper support from governments, business, and the public.

In summary, while it is difficult to point to any one thing as the key factor in renewal, certain themes emerged very clearly, including more capable and stronger deans and chairs, strong executive committee leadership, strategic planning and management, structural adjustments to committee structures, harmonious relations with the Board, faculty commitment, faculty renewal initiatives, effective external relations, and excellence in research and teaching.

Summary of Conclusions

Nineteen conclusions were drawn from the study findings and are listed below in the order in which they appeared in Chapter 6.

Conclusion 1: The financial crisis of 1991 and the February 1991 document Maintaining Excellence and Accessibility in an Environment of Budgetary Restraint were critical in creating a greater acceptance of change. Conclusion 2: Improving constituent relations was identified as a major, ongoing strategic focus for the institution.

Conclusion 3: In 1991, the University of Alberta was portrayed as having been largely unable to change in response to internal and external pressures.

Conclusion 4: Improved leadership, clear strategic focus, and harmonious relations between the President and the Board Chair were seen to be key factors in overcoming the decision paralysis reported in 1991. The streamlining of governance mechanisms within the University was also seen as a contributing factor.

Conclusion 5: Faculty commitment to the University and faculty collegiality emerged as key residual strengths of the University of Alberta.

Conclusion 6: The development of a strong sense of commitment to the University, judged by respondents to be a key factor in the turnaround at the

University, was seen to be a key role of the president and executive leadership within the University.

Conclusion 7: Deans and chairs were presented as being key to the strength of the University.

Conclusion 8: Cooperative relationships between the Board of Governors and the President appeared in this study as an important factor in the health of the institution.

Conclusion 9: Fundraising emerged in the 1990s as part of the new fiscal reality at the University of Alberta. Respondents called for clearer policies on private funding to minimize potential negative impacts in such areas as basic research, research in the humanities, and infrastructure support.

Conclusion 10: Faculty renewal was generally seen to be an opportunity to recruit knowledgeable, thoughtful, and deeply committed colleagues who would strengthen the University. Personnel issues within the University were presented as numerous and complex, and as requiring consistently high levels of attention.

Conclusion 11: Overall, the need for measures of accountability, which could assist the University in explaining itself to the public and to its funders, was seen to be much more legitimate in 1997 than had been the case in 1991.

Conclusion 12: The strategic plan, developed in 1994 with significant input from all parts of the University, and its subsequent use in decision making and resource allocation, were key factors in creating the perception that the University was well managed and that its decision making processes were trustworthy.

Conclusion 13: The University of Alberta was seen to have become more sensitive to the needs of students and communities in Alberta during this period.

Conclusion 14: Tenure and basic research appeared in the study as difficult to communicate outside the University. They were also perceived by internal respondents to be misunderstood and undervalued by external constituents.

Conclusion 15: In the case of the University of Alberta, effective leadership did not appear to come solely from a single leader, but rather it was diffused throughout the institution in a number of dedicated key people who were able to use existing processes to move the University forward.

Conclusion 16: Interviewees were dissatisfied both with the levels of funding provided by the provincial government, and with the perceived equity of that funding, particularly in relation to the University of Calgary.

Conclusion 17: The provincial government was not seen to be playing an appropriate role in sector planning. Its introduction of key performance indicators was widely viewed by interviewees as an attempt to control the University in an underhanded way.

Conclusion 18: Assessments of resilience are situational and key factors will tend to change depending on the circumstances.

Conclusion 19: The answer to the principal research question in this study (In addressing what was perceived to be a major financial crisis, was the University of Alberta perceived to have responded appropriately and adequately to the issues it was facing from 1991 to 1997?) appeared to be a qualified yes, qualified because of emergent problems and because the University was still undergoing major changes in 1997, for example, in faculty renewal and in updating the institution's strategic plan.

No attempt has been made to present these conclusions in priority ranking. Nonetheless, those conclusions dealing with roles and relationships can perhaps be seen to present the most essential points (Conclusions 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 15). This should not, however, be read to minimize the importance of other conclusions, for example, on the importance of strategic planning and management.

In the final analysis, the researcher was more comfortable in presenting the conclusions as a cohesive and integrated set of interdependent statements, rather than as independent statements that can be ranked as to their relative priority.

Discussion of Pascale

Although it was not used in developing the conceptual framework for the study, and although it was meant to apply to business organizations, the model presented by Pascale (1990) appeared as a useful framework in analyzing the functioning of a university. This applicability of Pascale's theory to a university is presented as a further contribution to the theory of this study.

The New Management Paradigm

Pascale's "new management paradigm" (p. 25) centred around four "vectors for organizational analysis" (p. 25) which he presented in the following manner:

> 1. Fit pertains to an organization's internal consistency.
> 2. Split describes a variety of techniques for breaking a bigger organization into smaller units and providing them with a stronger sense of ownership and identity (plurality).
> 3. Contend refers to a management process that harnesses (rather than suppresses) the contradictions that are inevitable by-products of organizations (duality).
> 4. Transcend alerts us to the higher order of complexity that successfully managing the renewal process entails. (Pascale, 1990, p. 25)

Pascale (1990) argued that the main challenge for organizations arises in coping with the relatedness of fit, split, and contend. The strength of this paradigm appeared to be in its view of diverse and opposing forces and ideas within organizations not as problems to be eradicated, but rather "as apparent opposites generating inquiry and adaptive responses" (Pascale, 1990, p. 215). This harnessing of diversity is also consistent with the basic tenets of the literature on

managing diversity (Morrison, Kanter, and others), with writings on Canadian citizenship values (Crombie), and with much of the popular literature on personal growth (Covey). Pascale's (1990) theory developed along four axes: fit, split, contend, and transcend. While fit and split are mostly self-explanatory, contend draws attention to the presence and value of constructive conflict.

> There are some tensions in organizations that should never be resolved once and for all. . . . We are almost always better served when conflict is surfaced and channeled, not suppressed. The contend factor pertains to the management task. (Pascale, 1990, p. 24)

Pascale (1990) viewed "transcend" as an approach toward management that creates the capacity for persons in organizations to push their inquiry beyond existing frameworks. This dynamic capacity was presented as emerging from the interplay of fit, split, and contend.

> It requires a different mindset. It looks to the tension (or dynamic synthesis) between contradictory opposites as the engine of self-renewal. It is predicated on the notion that disequilibrium is a better strategy for adaptation and survival than order and equilibrium. (Pascale, 1990, p. 24).

Applied to the University of Alberta, the "fit" axis includes characteristics such as strategic planning, vision (mission, goals, values), organizational culture, academic culture, tenure, shared beliefs and ideologies, strategic management, etc. The "split" axis contains such characteristics as the loosely coupled nature of the University, diffuse governance structures, diverse disciplines, competition between faculties and among academics, structuring of faculties and departments, etc. The "contend" axis, the formal and informal mechanisms for managing fit and split to permit access to the "transcend" axis, includes governance mechanisms (in this case, General Faculties Council [GFC], executive, Board, Senate, committee structures), collegiality, networks, etc. Leadership appeared throughout as a key

factor in facilitating the dynamic organizational discourse at the very heart of this model (Hardy, 1996, p. 187).

The University appeared to naturally embody the dynamic model put forward by Pascale (1990). The many forces of "split" within it dictated that a key role for University leaders must be to consistently strengthen vectors of "fit" and "contend," such as vision, strategic planning, strategic management, collegiality, and sense of belonging to the institution. In this type of model, displays of disharmony in the leadership of the institution, such as occurred between the Board of Governors and President Davenport, significantly weaken these central pulls. It thus appeared to be important that all members of the executive team be respected for their competence and that they be pulling in the same direction.

When considering the findings presented in the analysis of Phase 1 data, it was clear that a key problem lay in the movement of many aspects of the "fit" axis over into the "split" axis, in the ineffectiveness of "contend" mechanisms, and in important shortcomings in the leadership function (Department of Advanced Education and Career Development, Presidents, executive committee, Board and Senate, deans and chairs, recognizing in this latter case that there were many exceptions). For example, strategic planning was seen to be deficient, vision was seen to be lacking, the organizational culture within the University appeared to exist as a fragmented collection of fiefdoms, and collegiality was presented as waning.

Improving the situation within the University appeared a very complex multifaceted process requiring very sophisticated and capable leadership and transformative action on several fronts. This is consistent with the findings of Leslie and Fretwell (1996), who also found that approaches to change should be initiated on several fronts simultaneously.

Phase 2 of the study examined the evolution of the University over the subsequent six-year period with a view to determining where that evolution had taken it, if and how its perceived problems had been addressed, and whether new challenges had emerged.

Many changes occurred within the University between 1991 and 1997 which together combined to effect a major turnaround of the institution. Important changes contributing to the strengthening of the "fit" and "content" axes included renewal at the dean and chair levels; the emergence of strong leaders at the executive committee level; a new strategic plan, and a concomitant perception of strategic management in decision making and resource allocation; streamlining of committee structures resulting in more efficacy in decision making; improved financial and personnel management; renewed collegiality and responsibility, partly spurred by debates on restructuring, partly through faculty renewal and stronger leadership in faculties; excellent Board relations with the President and faculty; the emergence of the Chancellor as a politically astute advocate of harmony and renewal; much better relations with and appreciation by government, communities, business, and other external constituencies; a balancing of emphases on research and teaching; and a high level of trust in the executive committee, and in particular the Vice-Presidents (Academic) and (Finance). Also, a much higher level of confidence in managers and in the fairness and consistency of processes was evident in 1997. The commitment of internal respondents to the University was very strong throughout both phases of the study, as was their willingness to participate in the development of solutions. The strength of that commitment appeared as a key factor in effecting the turnaround within the institution.

A renewed commitment to excellence also strengthened the "fit" axis. Excellence was seen to be far more pervasive than in 1991. The President's major focus was seen to be on external community, and in particular, internationalization,

and he was seen to have left the management of the University to his executive committee, generally perceived to be capable managers of "contend."

Leadership

President Davenport's term was a key period in the transformation of the University. Presented as a tough technocrat who saw it as his responsibility to make difficult decisions, sometimes in a unilateral manner, it was perceived that he eventually succumbed to a combination of the forcefulness of the Board Chair and a lack of support from faculty within the University. Although many of the reforms were initiated and to a large degree implemented during his tenure, respondents were reluctant to give him unqualified credit, preferring rather to attribute these successes, at least partly, to committed people within the University at all levels. Several respondents felt that the Vice-President (Research) had been instrumental. President Davenport can then be seen to have contributed to both "fit," in terms of what occurred under his regime, and "split," in terms of how he was perceived to have done things. He was not presented as a particularly adept manager of "contend."

Not surprisingly then, renewal within the University was not reported as having been brought about by a single leader. Rather, it was perceived to have occurred through leadership at all levels within the institution, the collective sum of the caring and commitment of many, many leaders, not all in formal leadership positions. This commitment and a willingness to defend ideas and approaches coupled with the streamlining of governance structures and a strengthening of the intermediate leadership level within the University, all appeared as major determinants of success. Commitment to the University, a very strong force for "contend" in the study, was presented as having been solidified by previous academic-centred administrators, the very same people who were perceived by

many to have been asleep at the switch prior to the crisis in 1991. It was clear that President Horowitz still enjoyed considerable levels of respect from academic colleagues, which was not so much in evidence in relation to the last two "economists," and particularly in relation to President Davenport. Developing and strengthening collegiality appeared as a key role for leaders within the University, a finding supported by Hardy (1996). Leaders who were seen to be academics first, such as President Horowitz, appeared to have been instrumental in developing this strength.

Faculty renewal, an initiative of President Fraser, generally played to solid reviews but there were concerns that the practice of hiring "superstars" might result in financial and morale problems in the future. Thus, faculty renewal appeared as contributing strongly to "fit" or "split" depending on how it would play out in the future. Respondents were mostly optimistic, however.

The recruitment and training of chairs and deans was presented as continuing to present challenges. Poor financial incentives, the removal of administrative leave provisions, very large workloads, lack of career recognition of administrative assignments, and a loose approach to induction were all cited as contributors to the ongoing problem. Similar issues were raised in much of the literature in the area. One change in emphasis between Phases 1 and 2, minor in appearance, was nonetheless felt to be significant. In Phase 1, departments had been identified as the most important units within the University. Chairs were seen by many respondents to be a big part of the leadership problem, and key in changing the institution. In Phase 2, deans were seen to be "running the University." This change appeared consistent with the efforts to break down the balkanization of departments reported in Phase 1, through such initiatives as centralizing more decisions at the level of the dean, and hiring "team players" at

the chair and dean level. Chairs appeared to have gained far too much autonomy in 1991, which appeared as a major impediment to "contend."

Resilience

Resilience of the University, in Pascale's (1990) model, the effective balancing of "fit" and "split" and the existence of functional mechanisms for "contend" allowing the organization to renew itself continuously or "transcend," was generally seen to be much stronger than in the past. It was also felt that assessments of resilience were of necessity situational and that key factors would also change somewhat depending on the circumstances.

In the University of Alberta's case, the importance of vision, strategic planning, and strategic management as unifying forces, or forces of "fit" (Pascale, 1980) was strongly underlined by interviewees. As the University clarified its focus and directed its efforts to channeling the inherent tension within to positive ends, its image with the public and with the government appeared to improve and with that improvement, its self-assuredness and its ability to garner support for its vision. In addition, perceptions of bad management disappeared, and with that appeared to come a greater capacity of the institution to define its own criteria for success. Several interviewees commented on the positive dialectic and renewed collegiality which characterized exchanges within the University, important factors, it was argued, in a process of continuous adjustment and renewal. Pascale (1990) would have classified this as an enhanced organizational capacity to "transcend," while others might have classified it as increased resilience.

Implications for Practice

The study aimed at advancing the understanding of issues in the academic governance, management, and leadership of universities in Canada in the context

of the changing realities within which they must operate in the foreseeable future. The University of Alberta was among the first to undergo an in-depth transformation largely as a result of fiscal contractions. Since 1991, many other Canadian universities have found themselves facing similar difficulties. This was confirmed for the researcher in his contacts with administrators in some Ontario and Quebec universities.

The contributions to practice of this study are potentially many and varied. Firstly, it presents a broadly based analysis of one institution's transformation on the understanding that a case study, in whole or in part, may be useful in understanding other similar situations. As Merriam (1988) pointed out, "[The case study] offers insights and illuminates meanings that expand its readers' experiences" (p. 32). Hence, the case study appears as both a means of understanding universities in transition and as a means of furthering individuals' ability to analyze and assess the situation in a given institution.

Secondly, the conceptual framework developed for this study, based on the general headings in Peterson (1987), represents a useful framework for analysis. The way in which the framework was built from the study data ensured that it was comprehensive and that it addressed all the key areas identified by respondents. Given the very complex nature of universities, the existence of such a comprehensive framework could assist administrators in identifying strengths and weaknesses at the onset of, during, or following periods of more rapid change.

Another significant contribution of the study is in pointing out the importance of collegiality as a key strength of universities and as a key component in their resilience. Nurturing and developing this collegiality appeared as key roles of the executive team working with key academic leaders in the institution. Likewise, leadership in the university did not appear to be primarily about making decisions, but rather about creating opportunities and working mechanisms for

collegial decision making. The university as orchestra with the executive leadership team being the conductor is perhaps a useful, if somewhat simplistic, analogy.

The study also rehabilitates strategic planning as a key component of organizational strength. In doing so, it clarifies the conditions which must exist for strategic planning and management to be effective. The process of development of the plan was seen to be critical as was its connectedness to the environment within which the university must operate (Holdaway & Meekison, 1990). Further, and perhaps most importantly, the plan must be used, and be seen to be used in decision making in such key areas as resource allocation. Finally, the plan must also assist in making choices, rather than just listing a litany of alternatives. Institutions who may have downgraded the importance of strategic planning and management may wish to revisit them.

Academics also appeared as generally far more responsible than they have recently been given credit for (Emberley, 1996). It appeared as a serious error to underestimate their commitment to their profession and to their institution, recognizing that they are generally all seen to be committed to their discipline.

The story of the transformation of the University of Alberta is a story of hope and determination, the story of a group of dedicated individuals rallying around a shared vision to effect an in-depth transformation of their institution. It stands as a symbol of hope to those at all levels who care about their profession, their institution, and its noble role in society, but who may feel undervalued and unappreciated by politicians, the public, and academics writing about them.

Finally, the provincial government and other funding agencies might be interested in this type of broadly based study of a university. The study provides a more comprehensive and much richer analysis than one would expect to obtain from the measurement of key performance indicators, for example.

Implications for Theory

The conceptual framework developed in this study could be useful in designing various types of similar broad-based studies of Canadian universities. The framework is also valuable in that it identified a number of key areas and their interdependence.

Pascale's (1990) model likewise appeared as particularly well-suited to understanding the dynamic interplays within the complex organizations that are universities.

Other contributions to theory mirror somewhat the contributions to practice, for example in the importance of strategic planning and strategic management, in the view of leadership as facilitation through shared vision and working governance mechanisms, in the importance of collegiality, and in the strength of the dedication of faculty within the university. The study also reconfirmed yet again the importance of deans and chairs as key players in the health of the organization, and the importance of selecting them carefully and wisely. The study also identified human resource management, including the management of tenure and of rewards, as a key area of concern.

Universities appeared in this study as complex organizations with complex governance structures. It follows that any attempt to describe universities or to evaluate them must be very broadly based and very comprehensive. To judge universities solely on the basis of performance indicators or inputs and outputs appears to be fraught with peril, given the complexity of universities' mandates and of the universities themselves.

Areas for Further Study

Several areas for further study were identified. Key among them was effective leadership in a university context. Likewise important were leadership and collegiality, or what leaders in universities can do to strengthen collegiality both within faculties and in relation to the University as a whole. Also highlighted were constituent relations, or how universities can succeed in connecting with the communities they purport to serve, thus building their political capital. It would be useful to study the leadership approaches of leaders identified in the study as particularly effective in this regard.

The University of Alberta's strategic plan, and the strategic management (Gray, 1986) which followed its introduction, appeared as critical in the turnaround within the University. It would be useful to analyze the development, approval, and implementation of the plan to determine why it had gained such high currency and had such a determining impact.

Also, more research might be conducted with a view to identifying effective practices for the hiring, induction, and support of deans in their key function within universities.

Tenure and basic research appeared in the study as misunderstood and undervalued. Insights are needed into how they might be better understood and presented both within and outside the university.

Faculty were presented in this study as dedicated professionals deeply committed to their disciplines, their chosen profession, and their university. But it was also acknowledged that there were divisive forces at play among them, for example in having to compete against each other for research grants. It is perhaps time to identify and evaluate some of these divisive forces with a view to attenuating their impact or to proposing alternatives to current practices. It might also be timely to challenge Emberley (1996) and Bérubé and Nelson's (1995)

unflattering portrayal of academics as selfish and lacking any sense of responsibility.

In reviewing the literature on university governance, management, and leadership, there appeared to be a paucity of broadly based studies of Canadian universities, similar to that conducted in the United States by Leslie and Fretwell (1996). This may have contributed to the emergence of and the high levels of credibility afforded to such reviews as the Maclean's Guide to Canadian Universities, widely viewed by scholars as being seriously flawed. The conceptual framework for this study might serve as a useful tool in conducting more broadly based studies from which to develop more sophisticated understandings of the strengths and weaknesses of Canadian universities.

Personal Reflections

In undertaking this broadly based review of the University of Alberta in 1991, the researchers were struck by the high levels of commitment and frustration of most of our internal respondents. These people cared deeply about their work and their institution. And they were feeling largely betrayed by government and by the leaders whose job they felt it was to look after their interests. After our initial questions on issues currently confronting the University, it was not uncommon for respondents to speak passionately for well over one hour without any prompting from us. That this frustration was overcome and that many who stayed were able to channel their considerable energy to moving the University forward speaks highly of their integrity, their dedication, and their resilience in the face of powerful odds. As a result of those interviews, I feel that I have gained a much better appreciation of life within a university, of the high quality of many of the people within the University of Alberta, and of the difficulties in governing such a large and complex organization.

The University also appeared to be at the same time a very strong institution and a very vulnerable one. It appeared strong because of the people within it, because of its traditions, its ties to its alumni, its acknowledged important role in society. Yet it appeared vulnerable to neglect, whether neglect of constituent relations, or failure to ensure that decision making processes were working effectively, or again because of the absence of a central vision and a perception that decisions were being made according to that vision. The ascendancy to positions of power of persons more interested in protecting their fiefdoms than in the institution as a whole, the ability of these people and others to paralyze decision making and to neuter the management of rewards eventually suffocated the institution and appeared to turn many caring members of faculty away from an institution-wide focus and solely to their disciplines. A culture of negativity in relation to administration was clearly in place in 1991.

Yet, there were some bright spots. Respondents repeatedly pointed to a handful of deans and chairs who did things differently and who were watched closely as a result. Their faculties and departments were the ones that saw the reports of the President's Advisory Committee on Campus Review (PACCR) as opportunities to strengthen themselves and to improve their national standing. As is turned out, they, along with many dedicated faculty, were perhaps the beacons for the renewal, and several of them played important roles in successive years. Some left shortly after our 1991 interviews, some left later, after the turnaround had been effected, some are still there. It is my perception that the University of Alberta owes these colleagues, some of whom were interviewed, a great debt.

I was also surprised by the significant variance between the importance placed in the literature on the characteristics of the ideal leader (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988) and those of the President throughout much of this critical period of renewal. Rather, it appeared that a mixture of leadership and commitment at other

levels had been largely responsible for the successful turnaround of the institution. It was clear in the interviews that it would be a stretch to see President Davenport as the embodiment of the character of the institution and its central goals and values in a powerful way (Trow, 1985, pp. 143-5). Again using Trow's (1985) classification, interviewees explicitly questioned that President's academic and political leadership abilities, while recognizing that he had some managerial leadership strengths. But, given the very positive results, one might argue that his was the appropriate leadership for the times, that is, until one looks at the approaches that he championed and the amount of upheaval that they caused. Certainly, interviewees felt that much of the "toing and froing" had been unnecessary and unproductive.

It appeared in this study that Hardy (1996) was right in identifying collegiality as an "important mechanism in managing the competing pressures currently facing universities" (p. 183). For someone whose experience was mostly in other public organizations, the importance and power of collegiality to the point where it overshadowed the President's leadership as a key factor in the turnaround of the University, was indeed a revelation. This finding is consistent with Hardy's (1996, p. 3) contention that managerialism overestimates the importance of leadership at the top. According to Hardy (1996), "discriminating management" (p. 203) that is required to manage the modern university can be provided through collegiality, which she viewed as "a particular use of power that avoids conflict" (p. 234). This would appear to have been the case at the University of Alberta, a fact supported by the interconnectedness of many respondents through committees or other initiatives, who frequently referenced each other in the interviews, despite having no apparent academic or discipline ties to one another. The importance of "managing collegiality" cannot be overestimated, based on both Hardy's (1996) perspective and the findings of this study.

Sibley (1993) presented a challenge which appeared in large measure to have been met by the University of Alberta in the period from 1991 to 1997.

> When it comes to the question of supply of talent, expertise, knowledge, and inventiveness, universities are clearly far from bankrupt. The challenge now confronting them is to harness such resources to address in a serious and methodical way not only the fascinating issues at the frontier of the disparate disciplines, where our successes have been very real, but also the structural problems which institutions as such are facing. Such a shift in emphasis will admittedly be difficult, but, in the words of the philosopher William James, it is surely a "forced option." (pp. 128-9)

That challenge had not yet been met at the level of the post-secondary sector as a whole, however, although some progress was reported.

REFERENCES

Allen-Meares, P. (1997). Serving as Dean: A Public University Perspective. New Directions for Higher Education, 98, Summer, 83-88.

Alpert, D. (1986, Feb. 20-23). Organizational Models and Methodologies of the American Research University. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Antonio, TX.

Andrews, M. B. (1992). Trends and Issues in Post-Secondary Education: Indications for Administrators. In E. Miklos & E. Ratsoy (Eds.), Educational Leadership: Challenge and Change. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.

Andrews, M. B., Holdaway, E. A., & Mowat, G. L. (1997). Postsecondary Education in Alberta Since 1945. In G. L. Jones (Ed.), Higher Education in Canada. New York: Garland Press.

Anzieu, D., & Martin, J. Y. (1968). La Dynamique des Groupes Restreints [The Dynamics of Limited Groups]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. (1996). AUCC Trends 1996. Ottawa, ON.

Astin, A. W. (1985). Achieving Academic Excellence: A Critical Assessment of Priorities and Practices in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Balderston, F. (1995). Managing Today's University. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennett, J., & Figuli, D. (Eds.) (1993). Enhancing Departmental Leadership: The Roles of the Chairperson. Phoenix: Oryx.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders. New York: Harper and Row.

Bercuson, D., Bothwell, R., & Granatstein, J. L. (1997). Petrified Campus. Toronto, ON: Random House.

Berg, B. (1989). Qualitative Methodologies for the Social Sciences. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Berghofer, D. E., & Vladicka, A. S. (1980). Access to Opportunity 1905-80. Edmonton, AB: Alberta Education Communications Corporation.

Berkowitz, P. (1995, May). Responding to New Challenges. University Affairs, pp. 6-9.

Berquist, W. (1992). The Four Cultures of the Academy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bérubé, M., & Nelson, C. (Eds.) (1995). Higher Education Under Fire. New York: Routledge.

Bloom, A. (1987). The Closing of the American Mind. New York: Touchstone.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1998). Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods. (3rd ed.) Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Borg, W., & Gall, M. (1989). Educational Research. New York: Longman.

Booth, D. B. (1982). The Department Chair: Professional Development and Role Conflict. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research, Report No. 10, Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Bowen, W., & Sosa, J. (1989). Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brown, W. B., & Moberg, D. J. (1980). Organizational Theory and Management. New York: Wiley.

Burger, J., Fisher, J., & Thorpe, K. (1988, March). Methodological Issues in Educational Administration Research. In E. Mikos (Ed.), Study of Educational Administration Series, Resource Unit No. 3. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis. London: Heinemann.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1971). Dissent and Disruption. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cheit, E. (1971). The New Depression in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1974). Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Council of Ontario Universities. (1994, September). The Expanding Role of the State in Canadian Universities: Can University Autonomy and Accountability be Reconciled. Toronto, ON: Discussion Series, Issue 3.

Covey, S. (1989). The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Covey, S. (1992). Principle-Centered Leadership. New York: Fireside.

Cowan, J. (1994). Lessons from the Fabrikant File: A Report to the Board of Governors of Concordia University, p. 7.

Cresswell, J. W., Wheeler, D. W., Seagren, A. T., Egly, N. J., & Beyer, K. D. (1990). The Academic Chairperson's Handbook. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Crombie, D. (1982). Being Canadian. Ottawa, ON: Department of the Secretary of State.

Davenport, Paul. (1989, October). President's Installation Address. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.

Davenport, Paul. (1991, November). Making Choices: Annual Report of the President. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.

Deslauriers, J. P. (1991). Recherche Qualitative. Montréal: McGraw-Hill.

Dill, W. R. (1980). The Deanship: An Unstable Craft. In D. E. Griffiths & D. J. McCarty (Eds.), The Dilemma of the Deanship. Danville, IL: Interstate.

Douglas, J. (1976). Investigative Social Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Drolet, D. (1995, March). Appearances Can Be Deceiving. University Affairs, p. 10.

Drucker, P. (1993). Post-Capitalist Society. New York: Harper Collins.

D'Souza, D. (1992). Illiberal Education. New York: Vintage Books.

Dupré, J. S. (1987). Post-Secondary Operating Grants in Alberta: An Equity Study. Edmonton, AB: Alberta Advanced Education.

Eble, K. E. (1990). Chairpersons and Faculty Development. In J. B. Bennett & D.J. Figuli (Eds.), Enhancing Departmental Leadership: The Roles of the Chairperson. New York: ACE/MacMillan.

Edmonton Journal. (1992, February 8). Editorial, p. 8.

Edmonton Journal. (1998, February 14). Editorial, p. 12.

Ehrlich, T. (1997). Looking Back: Perspectives of a Former Dean, Provost, and President. New Directions for Higher Education, 98, Summer, 89-94.

Emberley, P. (1996). Zero Tolerance. Toronto: Penguin.

Evangelauf, J. (1992). Enrollment Projections Revised in New Government Analysis. Chronicle of Higher Education, 38(20), A1, A36.

Fagin, C. M. (1998). The Leadership Role of a Dean. New Directions for Higher Education, 98, Summer, 95-99.

Field, P.A., & Morse, J. M. (1985). Nursing Research: the Application of Qualitative Approaches. London: Croan Helm.

Feldman, K. (1987). Research Productivity and Scholarly Accomplishment of College Teachers as Related to Their Institutional Effectiveness: A Review and Exploration. Research in Higher Education, 26, 227-298.

Fincher & Cameron. (1993). The Modern University, Qualitative Research and Leadership. Paper presented to the Institute of Higher Education, Athens, GA.

Flawn, P. (1990). A Primer for University Presidents. Texas: University of Texas Press.

Foot, D. K. (1996). Boom, Bust and Echo. Toronto, ON: Macfarlane, Walter and Ross.

Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and Promises. Buffalo: Prometheus.

Gauthier, B. (Ed.) (1992). Recherche Sociale. Sillery, QC: Presses de l' Université du Québec.

Geertz, C. (1973). The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Chicago: Aldine.

Globe and Mail. (1994, May 18). Editorial, p. A14.

Gmelch, W. H. (1991, April 3-7). Paying the Price for Academic Leadership: Department Chair Tradeoffs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V.D. (1993). Leadership Skills for Department Chairs. Boston, MA: Anker.

Gray, D. H. (1986, Jan.-Feb.) Uses and Misuses of Strategic Planning. Harvard Business Review, pp. 89-97.

Grumbles, K., & Bregman, N. J. (1994, May 29-June 1). The Academic Department Head: Duties and Compensation. A paper presented at the 34th annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, New Orleans, LA.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Effective Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hardy, C. (1996). The Politics of Collegiality: Retrenchment Strategies in Canadian Universities. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Harrison, M. (1990). Diagnosing Organizations. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Herron, J. (1988). Universities and the Myth of Cultural Decline. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Holdaway, E. A., & Meekison, J. P. (1990). Strategic Planning at a Canadian University. Long Range Planning, 23(4), 104-113.

Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M., & Cook, S. (1951). Research Methods in Social Relations, Part 1. New York: Dryden.

Johnstone, D. B. (1993). Learning Productivity: A New Imperative for American Higher Education. Studies in Public Higher Education, 3. Albany: State University of New York.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books.

Kaup, K. (1991, March 28). A Review of Maintaining Excellence and Accessibility in an Environment of Budgetary Restraint. Paper presented to Dr. Bill Duke, University of Alberta.

Keller, G. (1983). Academic Strategy the Management Revolution in America Higher Education. Baltimore: John Hopkins University.

Lasch, C. (1995). The Revolt of the Elites and the Betrayal of Democracy. New York: N. W. Norton & Company.

Leslie, D., & Fretwell, E. K. (1996). Wise Moves in Hard Times. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levin, B. (1992). Coping With a Changing World. In E. Miklos & E. Ratsoy (Eds.), Educational Leadership: Challenge and Changes. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1986). But Is It Rigorous? Trustworthiness and Authenticity in Natural Evaluation. In D. Williams (Ed.), Naturalistic Evaluation: New Directions for Program Evaluation, No. 30. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 73-84.

Lozier, G. G., & Dooris, M. J. (1991). Faculty Retirement Projections Beyond 1994: Effects of Policy on Individual Choice. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commissions on Higher Education.

Maccoby, E., & Maccoby, N. (1954). The Interview: A Tool of Social Science. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Maclean's Guide to Canadian Universities '97. MacLean Hunter Publishing Ltd., Toronto, ON.

Marino, J. (1995). Clearcutting in the Groves of Acadame. In G. Larer & T. Harrison (Eds.), The Trojan Horse. Montréal: Black Rose Books.

McKeown, M. P., & Layzell, D. T. (1994). State Funding Formulas for Higher Education. Journal of Education Finance, 19(3), 319-346.

Meltzer, B., & Petras, J. (1970). The Chicago and Iowa Schools of Symbolic Interactionism. In T. Shibutani (Ed.), Human Nature and Collective Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Millard, R. M. (1983). Accreditation. In J. R. Warren (Ed.), Meeting the New Demands for Standards: New Directions for Higher Education, 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Millard, R. (1991). Today's Myths and Tomorrow's Realities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Millett, J. P. (1984). Conflict in Higher Education: State Government Coordination Versus Institutional Independence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morgan, G. (1986). Images of Organizations. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Morrison, A. M., & White, R. P. (1992). Breaking the Glass Ceiling. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Morrison, T. R. (1989, Jan.-Mar.) Beyond Legitimacy: Facing the Future in Distance Education. International Journal of Lifelong Learning, 8(1), 3-24.

Mortimer, K., & Tierney, M. (1979). Three "R's" of the Eighties: Reduction, Reallocation And Retrenchment. AAHE/ERIC.

Moses, I., & Roe, E. (1990). Heads and Chairs: Managing Academic Departments. St. Lucia, Queensland, Australia: University of Queensland Press.

Naisbitt, J. (1982). Megatrends. New York: Warner.

Nevitte, N. (1996). The Decline of Deference. Toronto, ON: Broadview Press.

Newman, F. (1987). Choosing Quality: Reducing Conflict Between the State and the University. Denver, CO: Educational Commission of the States.

O'Neill, G. P. (1993). Myths Revisited. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, XXIII(1), 108-113.

Ontario Task Force on University Accountability. (1993, May). University Accountability: A Strengthened Framework. Report to the Ontario Ministry of Education and Training.

Page, S. (1995). Ranking of Canadian Universities: Pitfalls in Interpretation. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, XXV(2).

Page, S. (1996). Ranking of Canadian Universities, 1995: More Problems in Interpretation. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, XXVI(2).

Pascale, R.T. (1990). Managing on the Edge. New York: Touchstone.

Patton, M. R. (1990). Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods. (2nd ed.) Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Peterson, M. (Ed.) (1987). Key Resources on Higher Education Governance, Management and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pitcher, P. (1996). Artists, Craftsmen and Technocrats. Toronto: Stoddard.

Porter, J. (1985). The Vertical Mosaic. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Public Affairs Management, Inc. (1991, June). Survey of the Perception of Universities Among Provincial Government Officials. Report to the Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education. Ottawa.

Reinharz, S. (1991). On Becoming a Social Scientist. New Brunswick, USA: Transaction Printers.

Richardson, S. W., & Wynne, H. (1988, July). Paradigms and Paradigm Shifts in Educational Administration. In E. Miklos (Ed.), Study of Educational Administration Series, Resource Unit No. 1. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.

Rutherford, D. (1992). Appraisal in Action: A Case Study of Innovation and Leadership. Studies in Higher Education, 17(2), 201-10.

Saul, J. R. (1992). Voltaire's Bastards. Toronto: Penguin.

Schuller, T. (Ed.) (1991). The Future of Higher Education. Buckingham, England: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Seagren, A., Creswell, J., & Wheeler, D. (1993). The Department Chair: New Roles, Responsibilities and Challenges. Washington, DC: George Washington University Press.

Sergiovanni, T., & Starratt, R. (1988). Supervision: Human Perspectives. (4th ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sibley, W. M. (1993). The University in the 1990s: Crisis or Predicament? The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, XXIII(1).

Small, J. M. (1994). Reform in Canadian Universities. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, XXIV(2).

Smith, P. (1990). Killing the Spirit. New York: Viking Penguin.

Smith, R. S. (1992). The University: Some Differences from Other Organizations. CSSHE Professional File, No. 12, Winter.

Statistics Canada. (1998). Canadian Statistics, Table 00580701 and Matrix 3327. Website: http://www.statscan.ca

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of Qualitative Research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Trachtenberg, S. J. (1988). The Apprenticeship Approach to Leadership. New Directions for Higher Education, 61(16), No. 1, Spring, 37-41.

Trow, M. (1985). Comparative Reflections on Leadership in Higher Education. European Journal of Education, 20(2-3), 143-159.

Tucker, A. (1992). Chairing the Academic Department: Leadership Among Peers. (3rd ed.). New York: ACE/Macmillan.

University of Alberta. (1987). The Next Decade and Beyond. Edmonton, AB.

University of Alberta. (1990). President's Advisory Committee on Campus Reviews, Tenth Annual Report. Edmonton, AB.

University of Alberta. (1991-1997). Academic Development Committee Minutes, 1991-1997. Edmonton, AB.

University of Alberta. (1991). Maintaining Excellence and Accessibility in an Environment of Budgetary Restraint. Edmonton, AB.

University of Alberta. (1993). Degrees of Freedom. Edmonton, AB.

University of Alberta. (1994). Quality First. Edmonton, AB.

Vandament, W. E. (1988, Nov. 30). Point of View: Those Who Would Reform Undergraduate Education Must Recognize the Realities of Academic Governance. Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A52.

Vijh, A. (1987, August). Do We Want Pirates or Professors? Canadian Research, p. 4.

Vroeijenstijn, A. I. (1995). Government and University: Opponents or Allies in Quality Assurance. Higher Education Review, 27(3), Summer, 18-36.

Weick, K. (1976). Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21(1), 1-19.

Wharton, D., & Corak, K. (1992, August 2-5). Forging Forward: The Strategic Planning Process as Talisman During Periods of Institutional Transition. Paper presented to the meeting of the Society for University Planning, Minneapolis, MN.

Whyte, W. H. (1979). On Making the Most of Participant Observation. The American Sociologist, 14, pp. 56-66.

Wynne, H. (1993). Evaluating Policy Performance: The Alberta Community Consortium. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.